1. Dr. Pusey's sermon for Nov.r 5.th

2. .... Letter to the Bishop of Oxford on the tendency to Romanism imputed to th (Tract

3. Remarks on Cathedral Institutions.

6 items in 2 vols

£ 125

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/patienceconfiden0000reve

PATIENCE AND CONFIDENCE

THE

STRENGTH OF THE CHURCH.

A SERMON

PREACHED

ON THE FIFTH OF NOVEMBER,

BEFORE

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

AT S. MARY'S,

And published at the wish of many of its Members.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,
AND LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. *Isaiah* xxx. 15.

SECOND EDITION.

OXFORD,

J. H. PARKER; J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1838.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

TO THE

REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF POETRY, AND LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL,

WHO IN YEARS PAST

UNCONSCIOUSLY IMPLANTED A TRUTH

WHICH WAS AFTERWARDS TO TAKE ROOT,

HIMSELF THE DUTIFUL DISCIPLE

OF ITS ANTIENT GUARDIAN AND FAITHFUL WITNESS

IN WORD AND ACTION

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

THIS SERMON

IS INSCRIBED WITH EVERY FEELING

OF RESPECTFUL AND AFFECTIONATE GRATITUDE

FOR THIS AND MANY OTHER BENEFITS.

PREFACE.

NON-RESISTANCE and passive obedience, in the sense to which they are generally limited, are but two sides of the same doctrine, (the former speaking of it negatively, as not opposing force to force, the latter positively, as taking patiently whatever may be laid upon one,) and, together, are only a particular application of a general principle. In religion, it is faith; under misfortune, it is resignation; under trial, it is patient waiting for the end; amid provocation, it is gentleness; amid affronts, meekness; amid injuries, it is endurance; towards enemies, non-requital; towards railing, it is "not answering again;" to parents, it is filial obedience; to superiors, respect; to authorities, unquestioning submission; towards Civil Government, it is obedience upon principle, not only when it costs nothing, (as obedience to *it* ordinarily does not, and so can hardly be called the fulfilment of a duty,) but when it costs something.

On this, (as on almost every other subject of morals) our standard in this superficial age is for the most part lax and low; not simply (as of course it ever must be) in the selfish and profane, but in the current notions of the day. Maxims are received as indisputable, which betray a mixture of Heathenism with Christianity, and which proceed upon no principle even of heathen morality. As a warning against this, it has been wished, in the fol-

lowing Sermon, to point out how deeply the principle itself lies in Holy Scripture, how largely it extends, how it was acted upon by the Church, in her healthy state, and how God has uniformly blessed those who acted upon it, and has chastised those who abandoned it. But though the circumstances of the day required it to be illustrated by the events, for which that day is so memorable, and that the lesson of those events should be inculcated, it was not intended to consider the doctrine prominently in its political bearings, much less to confine it to what politicians of these days would consider as such. For the temptations to offend against this law, in the extreme degree of rebellion, are happily very rare, while yet the principle itself may be broken very frequently. Over-eagerness to have what is really wrong redressed, when we are the sufferers; taking matters into men's own hands; *combinations* to use a moral compulsion upon Governors to abrogate what is really oppressive;—in short, a scheming, contriving activity of any sort, is, in itself, opposed to this principle, and likely to tend, more or less, to its overt breach. It is in the strong conviction that the enemies of the Church have no power to hurt her, any more than the lions whose mouths God had shut, while Daniel was in their den, to hurt His Prophet, but that those over-anxious for her, or who would help her by human contrivances, may injure her very seriously, that the warnings held out by God's dealings in such cases have been insisted on.

With regard to the special instance of the English revolution of 1688, the question is now happily one of practical importance, only, as relates to men's feelings and principles, not to any political mode of acting. We are now enabled by the distance of time, and God's intervening mercies, to look at that action in its real character, without dread of involving ourselves in practical consequences

which we would gladly avoid. Now, it were absurd or hypocrisy to suppose that the title of the present family to the Crown is in the least affected by the character of the Act of 1688. It were to confuse the abstract question of the original right of succession with the Christian duty of submission and allegiance. Our Lord bade the Pharisees pay tribute to the Cæsar, and not to prevaricate about the origin of their right. Further, the extinction of the unhappy line which were then in possession of the throne;—the circumstance, that the family now placed upon it, were not the immediate successors of that family, but came in in a more orderly way;—their long undisputed possession of it;—happily can leave no doubt in any mind that they are to be *acknowledged*, as well as obeyed, as "the powers that be." If, in ordinary cases, possession for a long period constitutes right, much more, where God's law requires men to submit quietly to "the powers that be," without defining how they came to be such. It was not in a legitimate way that the Emperors, whom S. Paul and S. Peter commanded men to obey, came to the throne, nor had they even prescription to plead; yet, as far as the subjects were concerned, "the powers that be were ordained of God." No one again can doubt that our early wars with France were wrong, on the ground that they were ambitious, covetous wars, independently of the question as to our title to the crown disputed; they were aggressions against "the powers that be:" our Sovereigns have admitted the principle by relinquishing the title; nor could any one doubt that the French were right in obeying their then king, and opposing ours. The contrary would be looked on as absurd. As absurd would it be, to think that the king of Sardinia has any Christian title to be Sovereign of this kingdom, though in the natural order of things, the crown would have descended upon him. It is idle, too, to argue, that but for the revolution of

1688, the present family would never have been placed upon the throne. Who knows it, or has any right to affirm it? All we know, is, that it would not have been there placed, *in the way in which it was.* But who can say that it might not have been raised upon it in some other way, as, indeed, that act had no apparent connection with it? The principle, which the elevation of the present family involves, is not the right of subjects to depose their Sovereign, but the right of the existing authority to pass over the individual next in succession, as disqualified, as a parent may disinherit his son. This principle often exercised would indeed make a monarchy almost elective, but it is a civil question, and has no connection with the duties of subjects. This sort of arguing about what *might* have been the consequence of a different line of action 150 years ago, is worse than idle; it is Atheistic; for it implies that every thing else must have taken the same course which it since has, i. e. that fate, not God's Providence, governs the world. As for those who, having been for a long period employed in sowing disloyalty, have now discovered that the doctrine of Non-resistance is disloyal, while one rejoices that they can in any way propagate loyalty, (though it be "out of envy and strife,") it were enough to answer with the Christians against whom the like charge was made: "We are defamed as disloyal to the Emperor;—yet they, who had sworn 'by the genii of the Cæsars,' who had offered victims and vows for their welfare, who had often condemned the Christians, have been found their enemies. The Christian is the enemy of no one, much less of the Emperor." (Tertull. ad Scap. init.) On the principles of Non-resistance, whence is resistance or disturbance to arise? It is, truly, the story of "the wolf and the lamb."

But to those of more earnest mind, who recognize the Providence of God, and believe that the tracks of past

events are not blotted out by mere length of time, but that as the Heathen Oracle said,

> Ὅρκου παῖς ἐστὶν ἀνώνυμος, οὐδ' ἔπι χεῖρες,
> Οὐδὲ πόδες· κραιπνὸς δὲ μετέρχεται, εἰσόκε πᾶσαν
> Συμμάρψας ὀλέσει γενεὴν, καὶ οἶκον ἅπαντα.
> Ἀνδρὸς δ' εὐόρκου γενεὴ μετόπισθεν ἀμείνων.

it is, as is here urged, of practical moment, to reconsider our own views of the deeds of our fathers, to see, if the oath of allegiance were broken, that we bring not its terrible progeny upon our race and name, by persisting in "allowing the deeds of our fathers;" not as wishing to undo evil by evil towards man, but to efface it by repentance towards God: so shall that which naturally could not be effaced, but must work on its own fearful consequences, be effaced by His loving-kindness whose it is to "blot out transgressions." What has been done nationally amiss must be by the nation repented of; and if this is not in our power, at least we may repent of what any of us have done individually by "calling evil, good," and increase our peaceable submission and obedience to that Sovereign whom God has now placed over us, not as the instrument of man's will, but as "ordained of God." The question, then, is to be looked upon not as a theory, but as an earnest practical principle, involving practical consequences in submission to God and man.

And if any be prejudiced against the doctrine, because it is opposed to the current notions of the day, let him consider how much besides of valuable truth will, in a superficial age, share the same fate. It is discarded, not because it has been disproved, but because it is "out of date," just as if eternal truth were a matter of Chronology; or as if any changes introduced by men could annul the ordinance of God. Dean Sherlock said, shortly

before 1688, "the principles of rebellion are openly professed and taught, and the doctrine of Non-resistance and Passive Obedience "*not confuted, but laughed out of countenance*." (Dedication to "Case of resistance to the supreme powers stated and resolved according to the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures," 1684.) But they who think a duty laid down in Holy Scripture worthy their serious thought, will do well (apart from the bias of vulgar opinion, or the fear of possible consequences) to review in their own consciences, how notions which they have adopted, perhaps, because they are generally received, can consist with the plain meaning of the Word of God.

This may be facilitated by the study of Dean Sherlock's book; who, for "the doctrine and practice of the Primitive Christians," refers to "that admirable discourse of Archbishop Ussher, about the power of the Prince and the obedience of the subject, which will not cost much money, nor take up much time to read." (Ib. pp. 2, 3.) Philosophers and politicians of the present day may be surprised to find, that Bp. Berkeley maintains the same doctrine, "on the principles of reason common to all mankind[a]."

[a] Abp. Ussher's work is entitled "The power communicated by God to the Prince, and the obedience required of the subject, briefly laid down, and confirmed out of the holy Scriptures, the testimony of the primitive Church, the dictates of right reason, and the opinion of the wisest among heathen writers." It was written at the command of King Charles I, lost, for the time, "through the negligence or unfaithfulness" of the publisher, and finally published with a preface by Bp. Sanderson, in the reign of King Charles II. Bp. Berkeley's work is the substance of three sermons, preached at the College Chapel; his position is, "that there is an absolute unlimited non-resistance or passive obedience due to the supreme civil power wherever placed in any nation.

The statements above made are altogether the same as those formally received by the Church in the Convocation of 1603—1610, in which they were "passed with one consent." (See Bp. Overall's Convocation-Book, p. 92.) The 28th Canon runs thus:

"If any man therefore shall affirm, either *that the subjects, when they shake off the yoke of their obedience to their Sovereigns,* and set up a form of government among themselves, after their own humours, do not therein very wickedly; or that it is lawful for any bordering kings, through ambition and malice, to invade their neighbours; or that *the Providence and goodness of God, in using of rebellions and oppressions to execute His justice against any king* or country, doth mitigate or qualify the offences of any such rebels or oppressing kings; or *that, when any such new forms of government, begun by rebellion, are after throughly settled, the authority in them is not of God;* or that any who live within the territories of such new governments, are not bound to be subject to God's authority, which is there executed, but may rebel against the same; or that the Jews, either in Egypt or Babylon, might lawfully, for any cause, have taken arms against any of those kings, or have offered any violence to their persons; he doth greatly erre."

The Convocation-Book itself is valuable also, as clearly and definitely tracing out the origin of Government from the Patriarchal form, instead of assuming any original social compact with the people. For the notion of the

social compact presupposes that the source of power came from below, whereas it is plain in Holy Scripture that it was derived from above. Scripture knows but of two sources of power; 1. lawful, whereby the parental authority of the head of the family was gradually extended with the extension of the family, and so became patriarchal, which was in a sense regal; 2. unlawful, that of conquest, as Nimrod. But of any state of things wherein the people had power in their own hands, to give it to whom they would, and upon what conditions they would, it knows not. "If," says Bp. Sanderson, "we will but follow the clue of the Sacred History in the four first chapters of Genesis, it will fairly lead us out of these labyrinths," [viz. whether Government or Property were first in order of time, and whether Government were agreed upon to secure Property, or Property was assigned by Law and Government; in a word, whether Government came from above or below, was voluntarily adopted, or was the original constitution of things, and part of the primary ordinance of God.] "It is certain, that as soon as Adam was created, God gave to him as an universal monarch, not only dominion over all his fellow-creatures that were upon the face of the earth, but the government also of all the inferior world, and of all the men that after should be born into the world so long as he lived; so as whatsoever property any other persons afterwards had or could have in any thing in any part of the world, (as Cain and Abel, 'tis well known, had their properties in several, and distinct either from other,) they held it all of him, and had it originally by his gift or assignment either immediately or mediately. Whence we may also conclude, both *in hypothesi*, that Adam's government was before Cain's property; and *in thesi*, that undoubtedly government was before property. And we have great reason to believe that after the flood

the sole government was at first in Noah, and whatsoever either property in any thing they possessed in several, or share in the government over any part of the world afterward any of his sons had, they had it by his sole allotment and authority, and transmitted the same to their posterity merely upon that account; without awaiting the election or consent of, or entering into any articles or capitulations with, the people that were to be governed by them. Those words in Gen. x. 32. seem to import as much, "These are the families of the sons of Noah in their generations after their nations: and by them were the nations divided in the earth after the flood." And so this supposed pact or contract, which maketh such a noise in the world, proveth to be but a squib, powder without shot, that giveth a crack, but vanisheth into air, and doth no execution." Preface, §. 18.

In like manner, the Church in Convocation, laid as the basis of their statement the same historical view.

Cap. 2.

"To him that shall duly read the Scripture, it will be plain and evident, that the Son of God having created our first parents, and proposing to multiply their seed into many generations, for the replenishing of the world with their posterity, did give to Adam for his time, and to the rest of the patriarchs, and chief fathers successively before the flood, authority, power, and dominion over their children, and offspring, to rule and govern them; ordaining by the very law of nature, that their said children and offspring (begotten and brought up by them) should fear, reverence, honour, and obey them. Which power and authority before the flood, resting in the patriarchs, and in the chief fathers, because it had a very large extent, not only for the education of their said children and offspring, whilst they were young; but likewise for the

ordering, ruling, and governing of them afterwards, when they came to man's estate; and for that also it had no superior authority, or power over, or above it on earth, appearing in the Scriptures, although it be called either patriarchal, regal, or imperial, and that we only term it potestas patria: yet, being well considered, how far it did reach, we may truly say, that it was in a sort potestas regia; as now in a right and true construction, potestas regia may justly be called potestas patria." And to this it subjoined the following Canon.

"If any man shall therefore affirm, that men at the first, without all good education, or civility, ran up and down in woods and fields as wild creatures, resting themselves in caves, and dens, and acknowledging no superiority one over another, until they were taught by experience the necessity of government; and that thereupon they chose some among themselves to order and rule the rest, giving them power and authority so to do; and that consequently all civil power, jurisdiction, and authority, was first derived from the people and disordered multitude; or either is originally still in them, or else is deduced by their consent naturally from them; and is not God's ordinance originally descending from Him, and depending upon Him; he doth greatly erre." (Can. 2.)

All the theories of the origin of Government, however they may vary in the details of their application, or even though they urge results opposed to what might naturally or legitimately be inferred from their principles, may be referred to these two; that which supposes a state of nature, (as it is called,) in which men, no ways connected with each other, did for mutual security establish a civil government, abridging their own natural rights, and setting kings over them on certain conditions,—the system of a "social

compact;" the other, that which supposes men always to have existed in society, as being derived from a common origin, and the authority of the governor to have been derived from that, originally given to the head of the family by God, (as Abel was naturally to have been subject to Cain, Gen. iv. 7.) the "Patriarchal system." And so (as Bp. Sanderson above observed) all turns on this, whether "property be supposed antecedent to government," i. e. whether men be supposed in a state of having something of their own, (whether actual property, or with Hobbes "a right of every man to every thing,") and thence to have formed governments for themselves, and so the original of government be with the people, or whether "government be antecedent to property," i. e. established by God in the first instance, and derived from Him. The former of these (and so the so-called "social compact") is obviously an unbelieving theory, (even if any who adopted it should not have been unbelievers; Hooker, although he employs some of its language as having been derived from the Roman law, manifestly does not adopt the theory itself,) and is that of Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Gibbon, Montesquieu, and other politicians; the other is that of the Church; and it is remarkable, that the latter, the religious view, though connected with the high doctrine of Non-resistance, found no acceptance with King James I, who wished to assist the insurgent Netherlands; the other, although virtually subverting authority, was a favourite with the court of King Charles II, so that "an original power by nature in the people was the only theme then in fashion:" (Sir R. Filmer, Obs. on Forms of Government, p. 18.) so little do states or statesmen often know of the principles whence their strength is derived! The unbelieving character of the received theory, and wherein this unbelieving character

consisted, is again pointed out by Bp. Sanderson. "True it is, that a mere rationalist, (i. e. in plain English, *an Atheist of the late edition*,) who giveth more faith to such heathen philosophy as affirmeth the world to have been ab æterno, than to divine revelation, which assureth us it had a beginning, (and some of the great champions of the opinion we now speak of, have given cause enough of suspicion that they are little better,) such a one, I say, cannot possibly get out of the circle," [since on any natural principles, property presupposed government, and government property], "but to us who believe the Scriptures and acknowledge a creation, the solution of both is easy."

In like manner Bp. Horsley:

"Mankind from the beginning never existed otherwise than in society and under government. Whence follows this important consequence, that to build the authority of princes, or of the chief magistrate under whatever denomination, upon any compact or agreement between the individuals of a multitude living previously in a state of nature, is in truth to build a reality upon a fiction." Serm. xliv. preached before the House of Lords, on the anniversary of the Martyrdom of King Charles I.

Some sentences are inserted in the Sermon now, which could not be introduced into the delivery, for fear of interfering with a service, which was to follow.

Exod. xiv. 13.

Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord, which He will shew to you to-day.

The history of the Old Testament is the Sun of all other history, Christian or profane. In it, the cloud which veils the mercy-seat, as well as the pathways of Divine Providence, is withdrawn, and the light from behind the cloud flashes through, the token of the Divine presence to those who can behold it, light to His people, although to the Egyptians darkness. So marked, indeed, is the analogy of the kingdoms of unseen and revealed Providence, that men must acknowledge it one way or the other; unless they trace it where it is less distinct, they will lose sight of it where it is most clear; unless they explain what is less known by what is declared, they will explain away what is declared by what is obscure; unless they make use of the light given them where they might see, it will be withdrawn from them where they think they see. Twilight, in that it has a portion of light, has a correspondence with day-break; and whoso, when the light is come, will not explain the indistinct outlines which he saw, "men as trees, walking," by the distincter and revealed forms he now beholds, must go on to walk in the darkness which he loves rather than light. They who interpret not what

men call nature by the Bible, will bring down the Bible to the standard of nature.

This has been done of old times. This very history of the passage of the Red sea, Josephus, it has been wisely noticed, "in his worst spirit of compromise," compared to an escape of Alexander; and the modern historian of the Jews, who, with a righteous indignation, censured Josephus, was himself much to be blamed for the like parallels; and what was in his case rightly condemned, was, in another form, circulated as religious teaching[n]. Whoso, again, will not recognize the finger of God in His providential cures, will not see it in His miraculous; they who resolve every thing into secondary or physical causes in the one case, and will not see Him who is the Cause of all causes, and worketh by all those things, whose operation meets our senses, will lose all sense for discerning His hand, where Scripture plainly declares it. When men had explained away, as the *mere* effects of imagination, cures, in modern times, out of the wonted

[n] These cases are adduced, not to censure the individuals;—the error was not theirs only, it is that of their age;—but to illustrate the exceeding liability to such error, whenever the attempt is made to interest people in the Bible, on the current principles of ordinary life, to make the characters of the Bible interesting any how to persons of any stamp. The Society alluded to corrected its work, yet it is instructive, that a Society in high repute should have fallen into the error, which had recently been so strongly condemned. It too was attempting to keep pace with the times, and to conciliate half-believers.

order of God's Providence, which, though no confirmation of a religious system, seem to have been personal rewards to strong personal faith, they were ready to apply the same principle to many of the miracles of the Gospel; when they had altogether ceased to see in any derangement of the faculties, a power permitted to evil spirits, they were prepared and did, as soon as it was suggested, deny it in the dæmoniacs of the New Testament[b]. And so, again, one may see the evil of a class

[b] A controversy on this subject, which led to the disbelief of the actual "possessions" in the New Testament, was confessedly the commencement of German rationalism. It is not meant, by the above, to assert positively that *all* insanity is the effort of dæmoniacal agency; (Scripture distinguishes sometimes σεληνιαζόμενοι from δαιμονιζόμενοι;) but only to protest against the arbitrary limitation of that agency to the Gospel period. Church history directly proves its continuance beyond that period; thoughtful and reverent observation will leave no doubt, that much termed insanity (as in the case of many suicides, but also in others) is in fact Satanic re-*possession* of the house which had been "swept and garnished." Our popular and poetic language, in its use of the word "possest," "what possesses him?" bears testimony to the former belief, and even, in our present use, shews that we acknowledge a phænomenon higher than we can explain. We speak thus of persons (to say the least) as not being under their own control, being driven about by some agency within them, impelled to acts, which, if they were their own masters, they would not do. Other languages express this even more plainly; and it is expressed more or less forcibly in all modern languages, e. g. *Fr.* possédé; *Ital.* ossesso, invasato; *Span. Port.* possesso; *Germ.* besitzen, besitzung, besessener; and so in others. Popular language is more philosophical and truer than scientific.

of illustration, derived from the Arminian school, whereby all sorts of heathen sayings are brought into parallel with Gospel teaching; so soon as they ceased to be regarded as the seeds of truth which the Divine Word had scattered among the Heathen, (as way-marks and finger-posts, looking on to something to come, and requiring correction and developement,) and were viewed as something independent and substantial, they were used as interpreters, or critics, or rivals, of Gospel truth. The words of inspiration again are glowing language, such as in human compositions is poetry; but whoso looked upon the Hebrew prophets as poets, forgot that they were the awful messengers of the Most High; as they who measured by earthly principles the actions of God's instruments, lost sight Whose they were, and Whom they served; he who illustrated the law given by Moses, upon the principles of ordinary legislation[c], undermined in his Church and people the belief that it was divine. Apologists, accordingly, in every department, have substituted a human counterfeit for the divine reality, by illustrations, by defending, (as they deemed,) divine truths on human principles, by explaining "hard sayings" through the commonplaces of ordi-

[c] J. D. Michaelis on the Laws of Moses; a book which uniformly exhibits things on the lowest and most commonplace side, setting out on the assumption, that Moses was an ordinary legislator.

nary morality, the justice of God by the expediency of men: and on this ground, there has (as a fact) been no more fruitful source of heresy or unbelief, than defences of the faith.

In history, morals, poetry, legislation, philosophy, language, physics, religion,—Heaven and Earth, a body of clay and a spirit breathed into its nostrils by the life-giving Spirit, stand over against each other, and whoso lifteth not up the earthly to the heavenly, will bring down the heavenly to the earthly. "Homer," says even a heathen [d], "transferred human things to the gods; would he had rather things divine to man!" If the body be not spiritualized, the soul will be carnalized.

The light then of all history is God's guidance, dim indeed often, and overlaid by the intricacy of human policy and craftiness, yet still visible to those who in the detail of the workmanship forget not the Maker, nor allow themselves by the study of the visible creature to be held down from beholding the Invisible. Even in Heathen empires He declares by His prophets, that "*He* changeth the times and seasons: *He* removeth kings, and setteth up kings[e]." Even there among those who seem to rule, He is the One Ruler. "The Most High ruleth *in* the kingdom of men," (an unseen power *within* man's visible kingdom, per-

[d] Cicero, Tusc. i. c. 26. Fingebat hæc Homerus, et humana ad Deos transferebat; divina mallem ad nos.

[e] Dan. ii. 21.

mitting or withholding, uniting or dissolving, giving strength or bringing age upon them, and directing man's free-agency, like the wild uproar of the sea, to His own ends, unseen by man His work, but ever present with and *within* His work,) "the Most High ruleth *in* the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will[f]." Pharaoh, Cyrus, the "Assyrian, the rod of His anger[g]," but "who meant not so, neither did his heart think so[h]," Nebuchadnezzar, of whom God saith by Jeremiah, "*I* who made the earth, the man and beast upon the ground,—and have given it unto whom it seemed good unto me, and now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, my servant,—and all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of *his* land come, and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him[i],"— these are but so many specimens and instances of His universal empire, doing all that is good, and ordering what is evil, so "that the wrath of man doth but praise Him[k]."

And this should be understood not simply of certain fixed laws, whereby the rise and decay of states are regulated, as that an enduring self-denying state should prosper, a luxurious self-indulgent people should decay, an upright state should acquire might, a crafty (like Carthage) should be taken in its own craftiness, and the like,—as if God were

[f] Dan. iv. 25. [g] Isaiah x. 5. [h] Ver. 7. [i] Jer. xxvii. 5—7. [k] Ps. lxxvi. 10.

separate from His Providence and His laws, and His law were an abstraction to which He had committed the government of things, and not rather that His laws were His own continued action, dispensing in one *uniform* way His sovereign will, because " in Him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning," but still Himself, personally present and personally measuring out to every nation its portion according to its works, in His will, whose will is the law of things created. For so personally doth Scripture speak, speaking universally; " with Him," it is written in Job[1], " is strength and wisdom, the deceived and the deceiver are His: He leadeth counsellors away spoiled, and maketh the judges fools: He looseth the bond of kings, and girdeth their loins with a girdle: He leadeth princes away spoiled, and overthroweth the mighty: He removeth away the speech of the trusty, and taketh away the understanding of the aged: He poureth contempt upon princes, and weakeneth the strength of the mighty :—He taketh away the heart of the chief of the people of the earth, and causeth them to wander in a wilderness where there is no way." Nay it seems one object of the relations of the Old Testament to correct man's Atheistic way of contemplating things, whereby he would substitute for the Living God some abstraction; as law or nature, or general Providence, or order of things, for the Giver and Maintainer of laws and nature,

[1] Chap. xii. 16 ad fin.

" the Lord who will provide" and order all things; and therefore it may be, doth God, in this place of Job and elsewhere, speak in such detail and so vividly, shewing that not only the ends but the means, not only the victory but the strength, not the power to persuade, but the eloquent speech, and the understanding of the experienced, are His, that He giveth or withholdeth, turneth them to foolishness or taketh them away, as He will. Not the great results only, (as men call great,) but the smallest, most insignificant means, every step of the countless multitudes who march along the high-way of God's Providence, is ordered by Him, so that they should " march[m] every one on his ways, and not break their ranks, neither one thrust another, but walk every one in his path." And hence God's saints so often in holy Scripture confess, that all their power and wisdom and might cometh from Him, not in general terms only, but in particulars, that He " girdeth[n] them with strength," giveth swiftness to their feet[o], " maketh them wiser than the aged[p]," " teacheth their hands to war[q];" for this faith in God's aid and presence in details, is the life of all belief in His general Providence, and without this, that more general belief is little better than an empty abstraction.

But if the history of God's dealings with the Jewish Church is a key to His governance of

[m] Joel ii. 7, 8. [n] Ps. xviii. 33. [o] Ver. 33. [p] Ibid. cxix. 100. [q] Ibid. xviii. 34.

that His larger family, who had "gone away into a far country[r]," to follow their own desires uncontrolled, much more is it to the governance of the Christian Church. For here we have not only the general correspondence of God's sovereignty, whereby the creatures of God's hands must either willingly, or against their will, be under His rule, must bear the sceptre or the rod of iron, and carry on His ends in their preservation or destruction, by their obedience or their perverseness, but we have the happier lot of being His family, the kingdom which He has chosen out of all nations to dwell in them. The Theocracy is continued, only invisibly. As God dwelt before by the Shechinah in the temple, so now the universal Christian Church is one temple, wherein it pleaseth Him to dwell, not now for a time—but "the Lord will abide in it for ever," by virtue of His own promise, "Lo! I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."

We must not think of the law or its blessings as passed away; our Lord forbids it; what does not yet remain is *ful*filled, *i. e.* filled up and realized, as an outline by the substance; the moral law remains; the ritual and the political had their fulfilment in Christ and His Church; the particular Providence of the Jewish people continues on in the Christian Church; only in the Christian higher far and more enduring, as the spiritual is higher than the civil Government, the relation of

[r] Luke xv. 15.

sons than that of servants, Heaven than Canaan. "The whole kingdom of the Hebrew nation," says S. Augustine[s], "was one great prophet, because it prophesies of one Great One. In the actions as well as the words of their holy men must we look for prophecies of Christ *and His Church;* but for the rest of the nation, collectively in *God's dealings with them.* 'For all these things (as the Apostle says) were our ensamples,'" *i. e.* types and images of us. From the mutual connection of the Head and His members, the Jewish people, wherein they image forth our Lord, reflect also His Body, the Church, as well as in their more direct resemblance; nor is it in their waywardness, or their rebellions, or their turning back to Egypt only, that they shadow out individuals, but in God's dealings with them, they picture His dealings with His Church, which He formed into one in Christ out of them and of the Gentiles.

God's dealings with them, then, not only give instruction, (as any knowledge of God must,) but are a prophecy; peculiar situations of the Jewish people are prophetic warnings or encouragements; and it may be that a very minute correspondence will be found between the histories of the Jewish and Christian Church. At all events, we ought to look to striking occasions, where God's dealings were more visibly manifested, as grounds whereon to build our conduct and our hopes. The passage

[s] c. Faust. l. xxii. c. 24.

of the Red sea, to which the text refers, was one of those occasions ; its typical relation to the Christian Church, S. Paul has authoritatively declared ; and S. Matthew that of the Exodus, which it completed, to our Lord's call out of Egypt ; the Song of Moses, wherein he praised God for His mercies therein, itself looked on and furnished the form and language of other prophecy ; and its use in the Universal Church, as a hymn of praise, shews them to have recognized its continued Christian meaning and application.

At the very verge of that deliverance, thus solemnly commemorated in the Jewish and Christian Church, when the whole early people of God seemed to be in a great strait, entangled in the land, and shut in by the wilderness, the sea before them, and behind them " all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, and his horsemen, and his army," Moses uttered the prophetic words, " Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord." The peril was at its height, the Church seemed on the very brink of destruction, Egypt, the emblem of Antichrist, was ready to destroy, and there was no way left, when God " made the depths of the sea a way for His people, that the ransomed of the Lord might pass over[s]."

These words, which to fleshly Israel must have seemed so strange, and which to weak faith echo so strangely still, contain two parts, a duty and a

[s] Isaiah li. 10.

blessing. They are not mere words of encouragement; they impose a duty, and annex a blessing to its fulfilment. "Quietness and confidence" were to be "their strength." They were to "stand still," and *so* should they see the "salvation of God." And this condition of blessing runs continually through the whole history of the Jewish and Christian Church. As, namely, the first sin of man was trust in self and mistrust in God, so the correction has continually been, mistrust in self and trust in God. When God has tried His chosen servants or His chosen people, the most frequent trial perhaps has been this, whether they would tarry the Lord's leisure, be content to receive God's gift in God's way, take, at least, no wrong measures for obtaining it, hasten not, turn not to the right hand or the left; but "stand still," and "see the salvation of their God." They who have stood this trial have been eminent saints, the jewels of the Lord; they who have failed in this, have been like vessels, destined for some high use, but through this one flaw, marred in the fire which was to prove and form them. Even when unlawful means have not been used, yet the employment of any means, until God gave *the* means into the hand, were followed by pain and grief. Thus Abram and Sarai waited ten years for the promise, and then Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai, and Ishmael was born; Ishmael too had a blessing for Abraham's willing faith, who resigned him, and his own hopes in him,

yet was he a grief to both Abraham and Sarah, and to their descendants. The child, whose birth they had wished for, themselves cast out, and "he who was born after the flesh," in himself and in his seed, "persecuted him who was born after the Spirit." By faith[t] Moses slew the Egyptian; yet because this earnest zeal was not sufficiently subdued to do God's will and His only, he was forty years a stranger in the desert; and yet one like unbidden act cost him the land of Canaan. Jacob obtained the promise appointed to him before his birth; yet because he obtained it in the way of human device, "few and evil were the days of his pilgrimage;" Isaac waited twenty-one years for the fulfilment of the promise, and passed a peaceful life, strangely contrasted with his son's disquiet. Israel, in faithless fear of Ammon, asked for the king, who had been spoken of to them in the Law; and it became a sin and a snare to them; and God "consumed them and their king[u]." Saul waited not for Samuel, for "fear the Philistines should come down upon him, and he had not made supplication unto the Lord;" and he was told for this first sin, "now would the Lord have established thy throne upon Israel for ever, but now thy kingdom shall not continue, because thou hast not kept that which the Lord commanded thee[x]." David (of himself hasty and jealous) evinced himself the "man after God's own

[t] Acts vii. 23, 24. [u] 1 Sam. xii. 25. [x] 1 Sam. xiii. 12—14.

heart," in preferring rather to be "hunted like a partridge on the mountains," than obtain that which God had promised him, until God should give it him. Jeroboam, though by nature what men call able and of a noble spirit[y], by not waiting, and by human wisdom, became guilty of rebellion, his house was cut off, and himself became a proverb, with the miserable title, "who made Israel (the Lord's promised, chosen people) to sin." Baasha[z] and Jehu were raised up by God to execute judgment on their masters, yet because they did this, and joined therewith policy of their own, the blood which was righteously shed, was demanded of their hands, and God "avenged the blood of Jezreel on the house of Jehu[a]." "Asa's heart was perfect with the Lord[b]," yet because he relied on the king of Syria for that wherein he should have relied on the Lord of Hosts, Hanani denounced God's judgments; "Herein thou hast done foolishly; therefore from henceforth thou shalt have wars[c]." The inaugural visions of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, in different ways, lay the same burthen upon them, that they should be the willing spontaneous instruments of God; use no words of their own, but speak every word given them by God: as the Apostles were afterwards forbidden to premeditate what words they should use, but were to "speak what should be given them in that

[y] See 1 Kings xi. 28. [z] 1 Kings xv. 29. xvi. 2 and 7.
[a] Hos. i. 4. [b] 1 Kings xv. 14. [c] 2 Chron. xvi. 7—9.

hour[d];"—an exercise at once of faith and faithfulness. And why speak of man, when He in whom our nature was restored, as a part of the restoration of that nature, and as an example of what should be realized in His members, underwent man's three-fold trial "of the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and vain-glory[e]," in this same way, whether He would obtain for Himself that which was His, in any other way than that appointed; which when He had refused, "Satan," we are told, had "ended all his temptation[f]." And He left to His disciples the same rule, and the same promise; "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake; but there shall not a hair of your head perish; in your patience possess ye your souls[g]." The disciple and the Church were to be hated like their Master and their Lord, to withstand in the same way, by patient self-possession of their souls, and with and through Him to stand. And, again, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, but whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it[h];" and "the meek shall inherit the earth." Through patient suffering did the Son obtain the heathen for His inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for His possession; as He said[i], "If I be lifted up from the earth, I shall draw all men unto Me." "It is enough for the

[d] Matt. x. 19, 20. Luke xii. 11, 12. [e] 1 John ii. 16. [f] Luke iv. 13. See S. Aug. on Ps. viii. §. ult. [g] Luke xxi. 17—19. [h] Luke ix. 24. [i] John xii. 32.

disciple that he be as his Master." By *patient* (the word implies *suffering*) waiting for God, an unresisting resistance unto blood, did the Church take root in the whole world. It would seem as if S. Paul's imprisonment was a hindrance to the Gospel: so, it seems, he may himself have feared; this was the affliction of his bonds: but they "fell out *rather*," he writes[k], "to the furtherance of the Gospel;" the "bonds of S. Paul in Christ" carried the Gospel into the household and court of the Cæsar[l], and "in all other places," and gave confidence to many; as in later times, the captivity of Rome brought in the Gospel among the Vandals; and Christian slaves took captive their conquerors. The afflictions of the Thessalonians sounded out the Gospel to Macedonia and Achaia[m]. "*The signs of an Apostle* were wrought among you," says S. Paul to the Corinthians[n], "in all *endurance*," as well as in "signs and wonders and mighty deeds." "The work of an Evangelist," bequeathed by S. Paul to Timothy and his successors, was to "watch in all things, and to *endure hardships*[o]." It is a *Christian* proverb, (and proverbs become such by the frequency of their application,) that "the blood of martyrs was the seed of the Church:" the Gospel alone made known that non-resistance was strength, because "the strength of God was made perfect in

[k] Phil. i. 12—14. [l] v. 13. and iv. 22. [m] I Thess. i. 6—8.
[n] 2 Cor. xii. 12. [o] 2 Tim. iv. 5.

weakness." "The more," says Origen[p], "kings and the rulers of nations and people every where afflicted them, the more they multiplied and prevailed exceedingly[q]." The spiritual sons of the Gospels were multiplied by the self-same means as His chosen people in Egypt, by God's blessing on patient submission to injury. "We are multiplied," says Tertullian, "so often as we are mown down by you. The blood of Christians is seed[r]."

[p] c. Cels. vii. p. 713. ed. Ben.

[q] Exod. i. 12.

[r] Apol. c. 50. S. Aug. in Ps. lxx. s. 2. §. 4. strikingly connects the death of the Martyrs with that of their Lord: he places them in juxta-position only, yet so as to shew how he felt that it was from His Blood-shedding that theirs had their efficacy. "When Christ came, He was crucified, dead, rose again, called the Gentiles, they began to be converted, became Martyrs strong in Christ, the faithful blood was shed, the harvest of the Church arose. This was the youth of the Church." And again, Serm. 287. in natal. Martyr. Protas. et Gervas. §. 3. "The Lord first died for him, as was meet, and Peter afterwards died for the Lord, in the order which was meet. The thorny road was first laid, and trodden down by the feet of Apostles, and so became smoother to those who were to follow. The earth was filled with Martyrs, as with the seed of blood, and from that seed arose the harvest of the Church. Dead, they testified to Christ more than alive. To-day they testify, to-day they preach; the tongue is mute, the deeds speak. They were seized, were bound, imprisoned, brought forth, racked, burnt, stoned, stricken down, set aloft for wild beasts. In all their deaths they were scoffed as despicable; but 'precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints.' Then 'precious in the sight of the Lord' only, now in our sight also. For then, when to be a Christian was a reproach, the death of the saints was despicable in man's sight;

And Justin[s], himself a Martyr, relates how, "when he was content with Platonism, the endurance of Christians, and their fearlessness of death, and every thing accounted fearful," won his first attention to the Gospel. "When an ungodly man," says S. Chrysostom[t], "bears rule, persecuting us on every side, and encompassing us with innumerable evils, then doth our state become bright and glorious." And not in these only, but in the more fretting, because petty, oppressions to which they were exposed. "We were enjoined not to strive," says Justin[u], "but through endurance and meekness to lead all from things shameful and evil desires. And this we can shew you in many cases, where men, from being violent and oppressors, were changed, being subdued either by narrow observation of a neighbour's lasting endurance, or having noted the strange patience of fellow-travellers when defrauded, or having made trial of it in commercial intercourse." And this the more illustrates their conduct under deeper suffering,—that they suffered, not simply because they must suffer or deny the faith, not because they could not resist, but because they ought not, and so would not. God forbid that we should so wrong the memory of the blessed

they were abhorred, held in execration: it was cast out as a curse, 'So mayest thou die, so be crucified, so be burnt! What believer would not now long for such curses?'"

[s] Apol. ii. §. 12. p. 96. ed. Ben. [t] De S. Babyla, §. 8.
[u] Apol. i. §. 16. p. 53.

Martyrs, as to think, (as the degenerate Church of Rome now traduces them[p], lest she should seem to act contrary to them,) that they were Martyrs because they had not strength to resist; they were Martyrs, rather because they had strength *not* to resist, because they had strength to resist themselves. They "filled the world[q]," (I use their own language,) had "penetrated into every corner of it[r];" they were portions of the armies. Early as Tertullian the appeal was made, "You[s] must decimate Carthage, if you would destroy us; spare thyself, if not us; if not thyself, spare Carthage." "No one of us," says a blessed Martyr[t] of the same Church, "resists, when he is apprehended, nor avenges himself against your injustice and violence, although our people is an exceedingly numerous host," (nimius et copiosus.) What, then, had the Christians turned against their destroyers, and employed against the worn-out and enervated

[p] "If the Christians formerly did not depose Nero and Diocletian and Julian the Apostate and Valens the Arian and the like, it was that they wanted secular strength." Bellarmine de Pontif. Rom. l. v. c. 7. He adds, "But Christians are not bound, nay, they ought not, with evident peril of religion, [i. e. in man's sight,] to tolerate an unbelieving king." See others also ap. Bp. Taylor, Sermon on Nov. 5. Works, vol. vi. p. 612. ed. Heber.

[q] Arnob. l. i. p. 27. cf. p. 9, 10.

[r] Lactant. de M. P. c. 3. fin.

[s] Ad Scap. c. 5.

[t] S. Cyprian, (quoted by Bp. Taylor, l. c. p. 613.) ad Demetrian. p. 192. ed. Fell.

luxury of the crumbling Empire that energy with which they upheld it, had they acted instead of suffering? Truly then they had lost their strength, avenged themselves on their enemies, and like Samson perished—as to their real life. But they "had not so learned Christ." "The weapons of *their* warfare were not carnal, though mighty through God for the pulling down of strong-holds, casting down every high thing that exalteth itself, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ[u]." They had been taught the lesson, which the heathen Emperor, when revealed to him, but half understood, ἐν τουτῷ νίκα; and women, the ignorant, the young, mechanics, peasants, overcame the learning and the strength of the world—by endurance; and then taught the might which they had conquered, to unlearn confidence in its own might, and that when they were weak, then were they strong[x]: they overcame by the rack, by torture, by the fury of wild beasts, by the flames, by the red-hot iron seat, by pincers which mangled the flesh so that there remained scarce a vestige of the human form—not by using them, but by enduring them; they endured more than we could think human malice could invent, or human sufferance endure: and in truth it was not what it seemed, but satanic malice which invented, and Divine strength which endured, —and so the smoke of their earthly torment went up as a sweet savour to God, who for His Son's sacri-

[u] 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. [x] 2 Cor. xii. 10.

fice accepted this sacrifice, and their countenances being "marred more than the sons of men," became images of Him, "in whom the Father was well-pleased." They who could not be overcome, overcame; passiveness and unresistingness overcame the world; they overcame it by Him who had overcome it, by taking up His cross, and following Him. And as they hung upon His cross, emblems, as it were, and shadows, yea and members of Him, He imparted to their sufferings one part of the efficacy of His own, and they also, by His might, being "lifted up from the earth," drew all men—not to themselves, but—to Him, whose witnesses they were. "Christians," says S. Justin[y], or one of his time, "abound more and more through suffering every day.—See you not how they are cast to the beasts, that they may be made deny their Lord, and are not overcome? See you not how they *abound, in proportion with the increase of their sufferings?* These things seem not like the work of men; but *they are the power of God, and indications of His presence.*"

And, afterwards, when the State oppressed the Church, and upheld a blasphemous heresy against it, it was by the same weapons that the Church prevailed, not obeying man, when God was the rather to be obeyed, yet suffering whatever man could inflict. It was amid Arian persecutions,

[y] Ep. ad Diognet. translated in Tracts for the Times, Records, No. 15.

profaner in some respects than the heathen, that the five times exiled Saint, Athanasius the Great, upheld and transmitted to us the Catholic Doctrine, the rich reward of the exile and persecution of nearly half of his nearly half century's Episcopate; it was by readiness to submit to all things that S. Ambrose and S. Basil retained the Churches of their provinces for the right faith; "he is not liable to confiscation," answered S. Basil to the messenger of Valens[y], "who has nothing; unless indeed you want these worn-out rags, and a few books, which are my whole substance. Exile I know not, who am not bounded by place, and neither regard this as mine, where I now live, and yet all, wherever I may be cast, as mine, or rather God's, with Whom I am a stranger and a sojourner. And what hold could tortures have, when they

y Greg. Naz. Orat. Funeb. in Magn. Basil. §. 49. p. 807. ed. Ben. (cf. Greg. Nyss. c. Eunom. l. i. p. 313. ed. Morell.) Modestus had expressed his surprise that Basil did not fear. "B. What should I fear; what suffer? M. What? Any one of the many things, which I can inflict. B. What are they? tell me them. M. Confiscation, exile, tortures, death. B. If you have aught besides, threaten me therewith; for none of these have any hold on me. M. How?" This explains the form of S. Basil's answer, which is no declamation, but a simple answer to threats. Modestus remarked that he had never so been spoken to. "B. For perhaps you never met with a Bishop." Modestus returned to Valens, and said, "O king, we are conquered by him who is set over this Church. He is superior to threats, words, persuasions. You must try one of the less noble sort. Against him, you must either use open force, or not expect him to yield to threats." Valens yielded.

would find no body, except for the first stroke? for this alone is in your power. But death were a benefactor, for it would bring me sooner to God, to Whom I live, and serve, and for the most part have died, and have of old time been hastening." "And thus," says S. Gregory of Nyssa[y], "he was set forth by God, as Elias in the time of Ahab, and brought back all to the right way, engaging with those under authority, combating with generals, speaking fearlessly to kings, escaping the hold of his assailants; as having nothing whereby they might seize him." S. Ambrose repressed the people who loved him, and overcame the Arian Emperor of the world by peril of death[z].

And when they received gifts from the State, it was not as mendicants, but as "priests of the most

[y] Paneg. t. iii. p. 404. c. d.

[z] "If you ask any thing of mine," was S. Ambrose's answer, when required to cede a Church to the Arians, "such as my estate, my money, or whatever else of this sort, I will not refuse, although every thing of mine belongs to the poor; but the things of God are not subject to the Emperor's power. Seek ye my patrimony? enter on it; my person? I will yield it. Would ye hale me to prison or to death? it were a joy to me. I will not be fenced in by the encompassing multitude, nor lay hold of the altar, imploring for life, but more gladly will I be sacrificed for the altars." Ep. 20. §. 8. And afterwards, "I may neither yield the Church, nor is it well for thee, O Emperor, to take it. Exalt not thyself; if thou wouldst continue to reign, be subject to God. It is written, 'to God the things of God, the Cæsar's to Cæsar.' Palaces belong to the Emperor, Churches to the Priest. The public, not the sacred, walls are committed to thee." Ib. §. 16.

High God;" they received them in the name of God, not for themselves, nor as "desiring a gift, but rather desiring fruit which might abound to the account[a]" of the givers. It was by a readiness to make sacrifices, that the "riches of the Gentiles flowed in" unto them, when they seemed to be given not to men, (who cared not for them and were content not to receive them,) but to God, Whose ministers they were. S. Ambrose could then boldly and truly expostulate with Valentinian[b], whom they had almost persuaded to furnish the expenses of the heathen sacrifices, "What wilt thou answer to the priest when he saith to thee, The Church seeks not thy grants, because thou hast with grants adorned the temples of the Gentiles? The altar of Christ rejects thy gifts, because thou hast made an altar to idols." S. Laurence[c] yielded up his life, not the treasure of the Church, committed to him, to profanation; he took not "the gold of the temple to give to the king of Assyria," and thus he saved the deposit committed to him, and by the constancy of his death gained to himself

[a] Phil. iv. 17.

[b] Ep. xvii. ad Valentinian. sect. 14. p. 827. ed. Bened. A characteristic saying is preserved of S. Thomas Aquinas. He found Innocent IV. counting money. "Innoc. The Church, you see, is no longer in the age, when she said, 'Silver and gold have I none.' S. Thom. True, holy father; but neither can she say to the sick of the palsy, 'Rise up and walk.'"

[c] See the history at length in Tillemont Hist. Eccl. tom. iii. p. 16 sqq.

a greater treasure, the crown of martyrdom, and many souls, which he won to Christ.

It is for instruction only that we may ask why God should so have annexed the blessing of conquest to enduring suffering, and made patience mightier than what men call active virtues. One would not presume to think one knew all the grounds: it may be that they have some mysterious connection with the sufferings of Christ, which pass our understanding; and some such connection is indicated by S. Paul, "filling up what remaineth of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church [d]"—as though it pleased God, that the union of Christ and His members should so be set forth, that as He is persecuted in His members, so the more eminent of His saints, who were more closely united with Him, knowing as S. Paul again says, "the fellowship of His sufferings, and being made conformable to His death [e]," should shadow Him forth, by suffering in the flesh for their brethren, emblems of His vicarious, though not of His meritorious, death. But vicarious suffering may be so far well-pleasing to God, as having a communion with the sufferings of His beloved Son, and doubtless it may make those, who are partakers of it, more capable [f] of the communication of the merits and influence of His Passion,

[d] Col. i. 24. [e] Phil. iii. 10. [f] See Preface to the Second Edition.

wherein they have been in a manner joined, being baptized with His baptism, and having drunk of His cup.

Then, also, it may be needful, in the wisdom of God, for the perfecting of His saints. As all trial implies pain, so the trial of the most precious vessels, it may be, is to be accomplished by pains proportionate. It seems not without special meaning that the analogy of gold is so often pointed out by Scripture. God sheweth us in this natural process an emblem of things spiritual. If even gold, which in the end perisheth, must yet be tried in the fire, how much more must faith, being more precious, so be proved [f].

But, besides, it is evident that so God's power and glory is most shewn. "Then all men that see it shall say, This hath God done, for they shall perceive that it is His work [g]." There is a natural instinct, which recognizes that when things are too intricate for man, God will interpose. Heathen poetry speaks of a perplexity of affairs, which claims God to interfere [h]. A Jewish proverb says, "When Israel is brought to the brick-kilns, then cometh Moses;" a saying remarkably illustrated by the whole book of Judges. And Scripture itself has

[f] 1 Pet. i. 7.

[g] Psal. lxiv. 9. Pr. B.

[h] Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus Acciderit. Hor. de A. P. 191. and the Greek Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς. Our proverb, "Man's necessity is God's opportunity," and "When things are at the worst, they'll mend," express the same belief.

consecrated a like proverb, "In the mount of the Lord shall it be seen or provided[i]," i. e. at the last moment, when faith and obedience have been tried to the uttermost, and there seemeth no help left, and that God would indeed exact what man could scarce endure, then would God from heaven avert the suffering, or crown the enduring faith by His blessing. "The Lord will provide." So Joseph rose from the dungeon, and Daniel from the lions' den, to rule empires for the sake of His people. The gallows were prepared, the edict issued, the whole scattered people of God given into their enemies' hand; the king passed one sleepless night, Esther ventured her life, the people was saved, the adversary hanged. Sennacherib[k] had arrived at Nob; he was "shaking his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion;" on the morrow it was to be destroyed; "in that night the angel of the Lord went out; early in the morning they were all dead corpses[l]." At S. Paul's first answer, "no man stood with him, all forsook him;" then "the Lord stood with him, and strengthened him[m]."

Then, also, since man's self-will was the cause of his fall, when he would be wiser than God, and in his own way be as God, God would thus teach him to submit his own will, to renounce dependence upon himself, to quit his own wisdom and his own schemes, let every thing, if needs be, go

[i] Gen. xxii. 14. [k] Is. x. 32 sqq. [l] 2 Kings xix. 35. [m] 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17.

out of course, and then, "when the earth is weak and the inhabiters thereof," it will appear that the Lord "beareth up the pillars of it, and will say to the ungodly, Lift not up your horn, for God is the Judge; He putteth down one and setteth up another[1]." It is a practising of our daily prayer, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven," a realizing, a qualifying for, a practising, a foretaste, of Heaven—to do God's will blindly, and consent that it may be done, cheerfully, without forecasting how it may end, whither it may lead, careful only about this, that it be His will. It is an Angel's life to obey unquestioning, and fits for Angelic duties and Angelic glories.

Lastly, there is room to fear lest, mingling in human schemes for her own security, the Church should leave her dependence upon God, and adopt insensibly the maxims of the world. "Resist not evil" is a precept plain in its *mode* of execution, though hard to fulfil; it prescribes a difficult but a plain track; but, admit the principle that man may resist evil, it is no longer easy to say where and how resistance begins to be sin. Man cannot avoid difficulties; they are essential to trial; he may, by shrinking from them, substitute greater, but cannot escape them. And this difficulty is increased by the very immensity of the interests at stake; all the enormities, which have given occasion in this respect to the enemies of God to blaspheme, have

[1] Ps. lxxv.

arisen out of principles in themselves indisputable. No one, for instance, could doubt of the superiority of things spiritual to things temporal, or that the office of a Bishop of Christ's flock was higher than that of a temporal sovereign ; that the sufferings of hell are so dreadful that any present agonies are blessings if they prevent them ; that men will be damned for wrong faith, as well as for unholy lives; yet plain as these things are, out of men's misapplication of their duties regarding them, have arisen deposition of kings, absolving subjects from their oaths and allegiance, encouragement of murder, treason, rebellion, assassination, lying, perjury, cruelty, butchery of whole bodies at once, from which God saved *us* this day. From the time that the Church of Rome began to forsake the principles of the Church Catholic and grasp after human means, she began also to take evil means for good ends, and incurring the Apostolic curse on them who "do evil that good may come," took at last evil means for evil ends. She, the Apostolic Church of the West, consecrated by Apostolic blood, shewed herself rather the descendant of them who slew the Apostles, and "thought that they did God service," stained herself with the blood of the saints, that on her might come all the righteous blood which was shed within her; even of the very Apostles, who had shed their blood for her. There is not an enormity which has been practised against people or kings by miscreants in the name of God, but

the divines of that unhappy Church have abetted or justified[g]. And if she so fell, well may those

[g] See Bp. Taylor's learned Sermon on the Fifth of November. He gives, as cases, the justification of the murder of Henry the Third of France, (which the assassin indeed did on the authority of the divines he had asked, p. 583, 5, it was praised by Sixtus V. in full Consistory, p. 589, 90.) and of Henry the Fourth. (p. 585.) The Gunpowder plot was apologized for by Bellarmine and others, (ib. 586.) So also the Massacre of S. Bartholomew, (see below,) and the Irish Massacre of 1641 by Urban VIII. "whose joy thereat could not be expressed," (see ap. Rushworth, t. v. p. 504.) and who granted "a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins, to the Catholic warriors who were labouring to extirpate the workers of iniquity, who infected the mass of Catholic purity with the leaven of heretical contagion." (ibid. p. 525 sqq.) On the "deposition of princes by the see of Rome," Bp. Taylor refers to Bellarmine quoting "twenty-one Italians, fourteen French, nine Germans, seven English and Scotch, nineteen Spaniards, and these all very famous and very leading authors:" (p. 601.) on the "lawfulness of a private man to murder princes condemned of heresy and tyranny," Bp. Taylor quotes some eminent authorities among them. (p. 605.) All through the reign of Queen Elizabeth attempts to assassinate were recommended by the Doctors, and blessed by the Bishop of Rome. See Nicholl on the Fifth of November Service.

It is, however, a remarkable but melancholy counterpart, that, previous to the Great Rebellion, non-conformist preachers maintained, that "for defence of religion, *and reform of the Church*, it is lawful to take arms against the king:" (Dugdale's Late Troubles, p. 73.) as did the Socinian Hoadly, that "we are only forbidden to resist good governors:" and the Statute of 1 W. and M. st. II. c. 2. §. 9. which not only excludes from the inheritance of the crown "any one who should be reconciled to, or hold communion with, the See or Church of Rome, profess the Popish religion, or marry a Papist," but declares "*the people in such case absolved from their allegiance*," strangely agrees with the principles of the Church of Rome; for, as Bp. Taylor

" who think they stand, take heed lest they fall."

The principle then of Holy Scripture, as interpreted by the conduct of the martyrs and the early Church, is to await God's time, to suffer so long as He wills, not to help ourselves—to " stand still, and see the salvation of God." The principle of the Romish Church was expediency ; it was a plotting, scheming, worldly spirit, having at first God's glory for its end, but seeking it by secular means, and at last, in punishment, left to seek its own glory, and to set itself up in the place of God. Nor can we exempt other branches of the Reformation from the same faithless spirit ; the forfeiture, for instance, of Episcopacy by Calvin and his followers, was done in the same spirit as the sacrifice of Saul, or the support of the Ark by Uzzah whom God slew; they acknowledged that *he* was to be anathematized [h] who might have Episcopacy, and had it not ;

argues in this case, " it is plain that killing a prince is a certain consequent of deposing him, unless the prince—be bound not to resist, and as really give over his kingdom quietly, as he is bound. For if any of these should fail, there can be but very slender assurance of his life." (p. 603.)

[h] " Let there be such a Hierarchy, in which Bishops shall in such wise be raised up, as not to refuse to be subject to Christ, depend on Him, as their only Head, and refer themselves to Him; then I would confess that they are worthy of any anathema if any shall be found, who shall not shew to it reverence and the most implicit obedience." Calvin de *necessitate* reformandæ Ecclesiæ v. fin. Opp. t. viii. p. 60. ed. Amstel. This and passages from other foreign Reformers are quoted by Bishop

but they could not; and, with Saul, they offered the unbidden sacrifice, and with Uzzah touched the Ark of God's presence, lest it should fall, mistrusting God's power to raise it up. And so now the Church of Rome, who was Queen among the nations, is brought down to the dust under the nations, and is in bondage with her children; and Geneva, which boasted of the purity of its doctrinal reformation, has been the seat of a worse Antichrist.

It is not (God knoweth) in any spirit of boast againt those branches, some of which were grafted in before us, but still in encouragement and warning, that I would notice, that herein also our Church followed the principles of the Church Catholic, and with her had her portion. She alone of all the reformed Churches was purified in the fire, and purged by the blood of martyrs, and had the evidence of affliction that she was a beloved child and no bastard. And her general conduct has been true to her first principles, to render to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's; to do nothing against the command of God, but to suffer every thing which the Cæsar may require. It was thus that the seven Bishops mainly checked James's tyranny, refusing to do, but submitting to suffer, what

Hall, Episcopacy by divine right, p. 1. sect. 2. who mentions that this passage of Calvin is quoted with approbation by Chamier de membris Eccl. iv. 1.

was unlawful; it was thus that even in the Great Rebellion men cheerfully took the spoiling of their goods; it was thus that in events familiar to us, the members of this place[i], at different periods, suffered what was unlawful, rather than compromise their principles;—and we cherish their memories.

The two events, for which we keep this day as an annual thanksgiving to God, together, strikingly illustrate these principles. 1. That we may safely leave things to God. 2. That there is great risk, that man, by any impatience of his, will mar the blessing which God designs for His Church.

In the plot, from which this day is named, God had permitted things to come to the uttermost; every preparation was made, every scruple removed; a Romanist[k] had solemnly given the answer, that, for so great a benefit to the Church, Romanists too might be sacrificed; the innocent might be slain, so that the guilty majority escaped not; the last feeling of humanity, as one would have thought, that to members of their own Church, was extinguished. The secret was entrusted to but few, was guarded by the most solemn oaths and by the participation of the Holy Eucharist, had been kept for a year and a half, although all the Romanists in England knew that some great plot was being

[i] In the times of the Great Rebellion and under James II.

[k] Garnet the Jesuit priest [and others. Nicholl on the C. P.]

carried on, and were praying for its success; inferior plots had been forbidden by Rome, lest they should mar this great one; no suspicion had been excited, and there was nothing left to excite suspicion, when God employed means the most unlikely, put, just at the last, one lurking feeling of pity for one person in the breast of but one, so that a dark hint was given to that one: and He caused him who gave it, to miscalculate the character of his own brother-in-law, or entrust him with more than he was aware; then He placed fear in that other's breast, so that, through another and distant fear, he shewed the letter which contained this dark hint; then, when the councillors despised the anonymous hint, as an idle tale, He enlightened the mind of the monarch, to discover the dark saying, which to us it seems strange that any beforehand should have unravelled; and when even then the councillors had surveyed the very spot, and discovered nothing, He caused the monarch to persevere, undeterred, until He had brought the whole to light. Yet to see more of this mystery of God's providence, and how He weaves together the intricate web of human affairs, and places long before the hidden springs of things, one must think also, how He ordered that one of these few conspirators should be intermarried with one of the few Romanist peers, and so desired to save him; and how by the conspiracy from which God had shielded the monarch's early life, He

quickened his sense of the present danger; so that while men were marrying, and giving in marriage, and strengthening themselves by alliances, God was preparing the means whereby this kingdom should be saved against the will of those so employed; and while men were plotting against a sacred life, God was laying up in the monarch's soul the thought, which Himself should hereafter kindle to save it. Verily, "a man's heart deviseth his way, but the Lord directeth his steps[a]." "The ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and He pondereth all his goings; his own iniquities shall take the wicked himself, and he shall be holden with the cords of his sins[b]." The words of the Psalmist, selected for this day's service, find a striking completion in this history[c]. "God[d] hid him from the secret counsel of the wicked, from the insurrection of the workers of iniquity—they encourage themselves in an evil matter; they commune of laying snares privily; they say, Who shall see them? they search out iniquities; they accomplish a diligent search; the inward thought of every one of them, and the heart, is deep: but God shall shoot at them with an arrow; suddenly shall they be wounded; so they shall make their own tongue to fall upon themselves."

[a] Prov. xvi. 9.
[b] Ib. v. 21, 22.
[c] See Barrow's Sermon on this text and day. Serm. xi.
[d] Ps. lxiv. 2 sqq.

But it yet more illustrates the teaching, and is an argument of encouragement to our Church, how God in two neighbouring countries permitted plots as atrocious to be accomplished. To human sight it is as strange that the massacre of S. Bartholomew should have been perpetrated, as that we should have escaped. The circumstances of that massacre even remind one of that destruction which extorted from the Heathen poet the confession, that it could not have been accomplished, "si fata Deum, si mens non læva fuisset." The chiefs, on whom it fell, were men, the wisest of their age[a], practised in avoiding surprises, alive to treachery, taught caution by their profession; yet neither past treachery, nor present oft-repeated warnings[b], nor the half-completed assassination of the chief[c], as a herald of the

[a] e. g. the Admiral Coligny.

[b] Coligny was warned by very many both by word of mouth and letter. Thuanus, l. lii. p. 805. "He was especially warned sharply in a letter, of the decree of the Papists, that faith was not to be kept with heretics, of the queen's Italian guile, and the king's profaneness, hypocrisy, and cruelty from his youth: a conversation of the king with his mother was reported, in which he had boasted of his playing his part to the queen of Navarre, and had sworn frequently to her, that he would bring them all into her toils." (ib. 806.) And again, by those of Rochelle, who, on being civilly put off, applied to the king of Navarre, but in vain; a play was enacted, in which the Protestants were represented as cast into Hell, which "some interpreted ill," so that F. Earl of Montmorency left Paris." (Ib. 808.)

[c] The admiral. The shot came from the house of a Canon, preceptor of the Duke of Guise, and the assassin was connected with him. Coligny recognized it as the fruit of his reconcilia-

impending massacre, nor the forebodings of one[d] "Dei jussu non unquam creditus," nor the knowledge that their enemies, who had feigned a retreat, were still hard by[e], nor the menaces reported to them by their spies from those whom they were trusting[f], nor the bringing them together like sheep for the slaughter[g], nor the setting a well-known enemy as a guard to their chief[h], nor the com-

tion with him; yet remained secure in Paris." Continuat. de Fleuri H. E. l. clxiii. §. 5. "The tragedy," said the Vidame de Chartres, "having begun with the wounding of Coligny, would soon end with the massacre of the rest; he therefore advised to quit Paris instantly." (Ib. §. 12.)

[d] The Vidame de Chartres.

[e] The princes of Guise, who feigned a rupture with the king; "but it was known that they had not left Paris." (Ib. §. 13.)

[f] "Some Romanist courtiers, seeing the Calvinists leave the Church of Notre-Dame, not to hear the Mass at the marriage of the king of Navarre, had told them that their scruples would not last long; their spies had heard from the servants of Charles de Gondy, the king's Chamberlain, that more blood than wine would be spilled at that marriage." (Ib. §. 12. from De Thou, l. lii. p. 813.)

[g] "The king had made the greater part of the Protestant nobles and gentry lodge near the admiral. The captains of the quarters had orders speedily to mark the lodgings, to take in writing the names of those who professed Calvinism, and to collect them as much as possible in the neighbourhood of Coligny; and H. M. said very loud, that every body might hear, that he forbad any Catholic to approach that neighbourhood, and would have any, who contravened this order, fired upon." (Ib. §. 15.) "These and other indications," adds De Thou, "and the reports every where whispered, had sufficed to warn the Protestants, if they had not been infatuated." (p. 814.)

[h] Cosseins, one of the greatest enemies of the admiral.

mencing tumults[l] could wake them from the death-sleep of security which was to end in the sleep of death. "Instamus tamen immemores cæcique." "Surely," says Solomon, "in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird[k];" unless, adds Job, "God hath deprived her of wisdom, neither hath He imparted to her understanding[l]." The devisor of the two plots was in both cases the same, papal Rome; she justified[m] that which failed, and Gregory XIII. ordered, and himself attended, a procession and thanksgiving for that which succeeded[n]; both proposed the

[l] "The admiral supposed that the tumults arose only from the people stimulated by the Guises, and that they would retire so soon as they saw the guard under the orders of Cosseins placed at his gate to defend him; he was not undeceived, until he learnt that his first gate had been forced, and that a musket had been fired in his court." (Ib. §. 20.) "A little before," says De Thou, p. 815, "observant persons had noticed that armed men were running to and fro in the city and round the Louvre; that the people were excited, threats every where heard, and thence they anticipated what would be; but Coligny only sent to inform the king, who assured him he had nothing to fear. At the same time, Teligni was told, that porters were carrying arms into the Louvre; but he despised the report, blamed such suspicions as needless, and forbad to inform Coligny of them."

[k] Prov. i. 17.

[l] Job xxxix. 17.

[m] See above, p. 28.

[n] Ib. §. 40. Gregory also "struck some medals to perpetuate its memory; on one side of which was himself, on the other an angel holding a cross in one hand, and a sword in the other, exterminating heretics, and especially the admiral." "This he did," we are told, "regarding only the benefit which he ima-

same thing, the advancement of Romanism by the extinction of heretics; the one was carried on secretly, the other almost openly: of the one there were no intimations beforehand; in the other, they were frequent: the one seemed secure, being intrusted to a few; the other was in the hands of many: in the one, he on whom the execution depended, shrunk from sin so dreadful; Charles the Ninth, like Ahab whom Jezebel his wife stirred up, hesitated to the very last, and was ready to retract[o]; in the other they had no compunctions, or had stifled them. The depth of guilt in the massacre of S. Bartholomew, (if any thing,) seemed the more to call down the avenging interference of God, through the multiplied hypocrisy and perjuries whereby it was carried on[p]; yet the one, which every thing

gined must result from it to the Catholic religion in France." Ib. from the Trésor Chronol. du P. de S. Romuald in fol. p. 661.

[o] "The queen, even at midnight, fearing lest the king, whom she thought she perceived still fluctuating and hesitating at the atrocity of the guilt, should change, went to his bedchamber, whither Anjou and others, and Guise, presently repaired, as agreed on. Then they relate, that after a long conversation to and fro, the king, when hesitating, was rebuked by his mother, for that by the delay he was letting slip so fair an occasion of subduing his enemies. At which speech, the king being of a very savage spirit and accustomed to shed blood, was fired, as being charged with cowardice, and gave orders for its execution. The queen, taking advantage of this impulse, lest he should relax, if an interval were given, hastened the signal, which was to have been given before day-break." De Thou, p. 816.

[p] Especially on the part of Charles the Ninth. It was per-

earthly combined to overthrow, succeeded; the other, which every thing tended to ensure, failed. "Verily, there is a God that judgeth the earth."

"Thy way is in the sea, and Thy path in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known;" and it is Thou who "leddest Thy people like a flock[a]," though by human hand. Far be it from us to say that we understand God's counsels; why in the one case He sent warnings, yet allowed the plot to be completed; in the other He sent none, but Himself destroyed it; He seemed to "take His rest, and to consider in His dwelling-place, like a clear heat upon herbs, like a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest," [as it were, Himself maturing and bringing about their devices,] "but afore the harvest, when the bud was perfect, and the flower become the ripening grape, He cut off the sprigs—and took away, and cut down the branches[b]:" but this we must see, that those who were delivered (though not for their own merits) were passive, and that it was all God's hand; while the foreign Protestants, who perished, were an active, busy, scheming body, with worldly wisdom; and again we must with thankfulness acknowledge that it was the English Church whom God so preserved.

mitted, but avenged. His mother survived all her children but one, who was slain shortly afterwards, and she who had "made mothers childless," was "childless among women," her family extinct.

[a] Ps. lxxvii. 19, 20.

[b] Is. xviii. 4, 5.

Yet even our much-distinguished and blessed Church has not been secure, when she forgot wherein "her great strength lay." In Ireland, for a time, she mingled her counsels with those of a different reformation[a], joined in turbulent proceedings against her earthly sovereign, and sunk her peculiar character in the cabals of earthly politics. Towards her Romanist fellow-subjects she preserved gentleness and peace, and they had been remarkably favoured[b]. Yet "God brought fire out of the house of Abimelech to devour the men of Shechem;" her evil towards Charles He requited upon her own head from those whom she trusted, and among whom she dwelt securely. In this case, again, all things human combined to discover the plot, and in human sight its concealment seemed inexplicable[c];

[a] "The British Protestants, transplanted in Ireland, having every moment before their eyes all the horrors of popery, had naturally been carried into the opposite extreme, and had *universally* adopted the highest principles and practices of the puritans. Monarchy, as well as the hierarchy, was become odious to them; and every method of limiting the authority of the crown, and detaching themselves from the king of England, was greedily adopted and pursued." Hume, Hist. c. 55, who proceeds to mention some of their measures against their king.

[b] Sir J. Temple (an Irish Privy-Councillor), Irish Rebellion, p. 14, 15, 81. Declaration of Commons concerning the rise of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland, July 25, 1643, ap. Rushworth, p. iii. vol. ii. p. 346. Hume l. c. Lord Orrery ap. Nalson, Impartial Collection, vol. ii. p. 535.

[c] "First, I must needs say, howsoever I have observed in the nature of the Irish such a kind of dull and deep reservedness, as makes them with much silence and secresie to carry on their business: yet I cannot but consider with great admiration how this mischievous plot, which was to be so generally at the

but again all the hints were neglected[d]; the plot had been from six to eight years in preparation[e]; it was well known in England, Spain, and other foreign countries[f]; intimations were given to the king, and by him communicated[g], but neglected by those whose lives were threatened; revealed at last by one of the religion which was to be extirpated, but only when too late[h]; the means of its execution were put into men's hands by those professedly most hostile to them[i]; and a massacre,

same time, and at so many several places acted, and therefore necessarily known to so many several persons, should without any noise be brought to such maturity, as to arrive at the very point of execution, without any notice or intimation given to any two of that huge multitude of persons who were generally designed (as most of them did) to perish in it." Temple, p. 16, 17. The Long Parliament, to exculpate itself, and as a pretext for their rebellion, dared to ascribe the plot to our martyred Charles; but their statement of the utter unlikelihood of the plot in itself is illustrative. See Declaration of the Commons, ap. Rushworth, l. c. v. fin. See also Letter of Irish Council, ap. Nalson, p. 516.

[d] Temple, p. 17. Nalson, ii. p. 519.

[e] Temple, p. 67.

[f] Testimony of the Popish priests named in Temple, p. 67.

[g] By his Embassadors in Spain; see Rushworth, p. [408.] Nalson, ii. p. 565.

[h] Temple, p. 18 sqq.

[i] The 8,000 men of the army raised by Strafford, which the Long Parliament detained and turned loose upon Ireland. Hume l. c. The Roman Catholic members joined in preventing their being sent abroad, as the king wished, on the plea that they might become disaffected, if they served with the Spaniards. Nalson, ii. 565. It is mentioned in Lord Macguire's account as one of the encouragements to the rebellion. Ib. 544. Hume names also as a ground, that "the Catholics *assisted by the Protestants*, had so diminished the royal prerogative, and

more horrible perhaps in its details of cruelty[k] than any other upon record, fell unabated upon this portion of our Church; for "their Rock had sold them, and the Lord had shut them up[l]."

And now we may perhaps the more readily learn our lesson from that other event, which has been included in this day's thanksgiving, the arrival on this day of him who became William III. Man's sin is no hindrance to thankfulness for God's mercy; rather, the more we sinned, the more should we be thankful to God for not giving us over to our sins, for making that, as it now is[m], at last legitimate to us and our duty, which in our forefathers was sin, yea, and for the chastisements with which He has visited our sins. The arrival of William was in itself, on God's part, a blessing; it was not, we may trust, on that of the Prince, a guilty act; at all events we may separate the mercy of God from the sin of man; it prevented further acts of tyranny on the part of James; it probably saved the nation from the miseries of

the power of the lieutenant, as would much facilitate any conspiracy."

[k] "By the computation of the priests themselves that were present, and principal actors in all those tragedies, and were directed by some chief rebels of Ireland to take this computation, 154,000 Protestants, men, women, and children, were massacred between Oct. 23, and March 1." Declaration of Commons, l. c. The atrocious details are given at length by Sir J. Temple, p. 84 sqq. as attested upon oath. He computes the whole number destroyed at 300,000, men, women, and children. P. 6.

[l] Deut. xxxii. 30.

[m] See Preface, p. vi sqq.

anarchy and civil war, which but for his arrival, had men pursued the same course, might have followed, and in this the Church and nation might have been grievously injured; and for this and for the preservation of our Church amid this convulsion, we have great cause of thankfulness. Further, it seems that their sin was not wilful, that they no more foresaw that they should end in dethroning the son[m], than Cromwell thought at first of murdering the father; it may be too that our forefathers in a degree deceived themselves, and persuaded themselves, that because they did not *formally* dethrone their sovereign, they were not guilty of rebellion; and it may be also that God, in His mercy, may have accepted this their shame, whereby they shrunk from their own act, and so mitigated His judgments: but it were in us but hypocrisy to use these pleas, and justify the action of our forefathers; to say, that when a sovereign retreats from his kingdom before an advancing foreign army, his servants arrested, and his guards displaced, he is other than deposed; that they who join herein are not guilty of rebellion; and that they who in a self-called convention made the prince

[m] The decision to appoint a king rather than a regent was carried only by *two* votes in the House of Lords; and that, in the absence of those, who (as the Primate) held the whole meeting illegal. The revolution was obviously accomplished finally, by the refusal of William to accept of any thing short of the Crown, and the dread of consequent anarchy: *i. e.* they adopted a measure, which they would gladly have avoided, but which their first wrong steps forced upon them.

of Orange king, did not act against their allegiance to the sovereign, to whom they had plighted their faith. The misconduct of one justifies not the sin of another; David, though of God anointed, lifted not his hand against him, who had been once anointed by God, though now his princely spirit was taken from him, and "an evil spirit from the Lord came upon him[n];" and so, while we thank God, we should humble ourselves, and pray Him, not to remember our sins, or the sins of our forefathers.

It is not without an apparent Providence that these two events are so brought together upon the same day; the one, in which, without his own merit, man was passive, and God delivered him from extremest peril; in the other, where, had men like our Bishops and a Confessor of this place[o], remained passive under the shadow of God's wings, the tyranny had passed over, man interposed schemes of his own; they did that, which their Lord upon the cross was taunted to do, but did not,—[p] they "saved themselves;" and so they were permitted to mar the good purpose of God. I say, "mar;" for though God has been abundant in mercy, no one can have traced the state of our Church and nation, since that second rebellion, without seeing God's judg-

[n] 1 Sam. xvi. 14 sqq.

[o] Hough, President of Magdalen College.

[p] "What did He teach thee, in that He hung there, in that He would not come down, but endurance amidst taunts, but that thou shouldest be strong in Thy God." S. Aug. Enarr. in Ps. lxx. Serm. i. §. 11.

ments, though tempered with mercy. Let any one ask when was the golden age of our Divines? All will say, the reign of Charles II., when their passive virtues had been called out, and they exercised by suffering. The last century every one as readily condemns as the deadest and shallowest period of English theology, and of the English Church. And this could be traced (were this the place) to the line which men took in resisting James's evil. The State feared and hated the Church, which it causelessly suspected; it could not understand that men might on principle object to the act which set the Sovereign on the throne, and yet upon principle obey, yea teach others cheerfully to obey, the Sovereign whom God had permitted to be so placed. It ejected a valuable portion of her members, the Nonjurors; divided, and so weakened her; cut off from her one element of teaching; gave her Bishops for secular ends[q], and profaned her offices to strengthen secular parties; wilfully corrupted her, and stirred up enemies against her and our Holy Faith[r]. As clearly could it be shewn that the present storm, which lowers around our Church and State, is but a drawing out of the principles of what men have dared to call the "glorious revolution;" as that revolution (though in this

[q] On the gradual usurpations of the Ministers of the Crown in the disposal of the higher offices of the Church, see a series of papers in the British Magazine, beginning from Feb. 1837.

[r] See "Remarks on the benefits of Cathedral Institutions, and on Clerical Education," p. 124—128. ed. 2.

portion of our country, but still in this only, by God's mercy without bloodshed, as indeed, besides His other mercies, He generally restrains men in a second revolution, by an implanted instinct, from renewing the miseries of the first) was the sequel[s] and result of the first rebellion. The name given to the act of 1688 is no question of words; the very service of this day evinces the feeling even of such as could take the oath of allegiance to William, that it is not indifferent to God, how we look back upon His dealings with our forefathers: if we would not be partakers with other men's sins, we must disavow them; while we boast of them, we make ourselves sharers in them; if we would cut off the curse entailed by the fathers upon the children[t], we must disclaim the act which has entailed it; we should thankfully acknowledge God's "undeserved mercies," not glory in our fathers' sins, so may He exempt us from the impending chastisement.

Not so our Church, who in her most solemn service, acknowledges unto God, that kings "have His authority," that they "are His ministers." Even the service of the day, as far as it may in any degree, since she acquiesced in its adoption, be regarded as her voice, speaks of "the wisdom and justice of God's Providence," and we acknowledge it to be

[s] The lax principles, which had gained ground through the first rebellion, are strongly noticed, in the interval before 1688, in the writings already referred to, by Bp. Sanderson (especially §. xix.) and Dean Sherlock.

[t] See Bp. Taylor's Sermon, "The Entailed Curse cut off."

such that James's evil fell upon his own head, that all his unrighteous acts hurt himself; but she speaks not of our glory, but of "God's great and undeserved goodness." And again, the Homily on Rebellion seems by its very words prophetically to have denounced the measure wherein men now glory. "Had Englishmen," these are its words[u], "at that time known their duty to their prince set forth in God's word, would natural subjects have rebelled against their sovereign lord the king? Would English subjects have taken part against the king of England and Englishmen with the French [one need but change the nation] king and Frenchmen? Would they have sent for and received the Dauphin of France with a great army of Frenchmen into the realm of England? Would they have sworn fidelity to the Dauphin of France, breaking their oath of fidelity to their natural lord the king of England, and have stood under the Dauphin's banner displayed against the king of England? Would they have expelled their sovereign lord the king of England out of London, the chief city of England?" The parallel ceases; if the Homily condemned the hard terms placed upon king John, much more would it the refusal of all terms to king James. The excuse that James was a bad king, in the sentiments of the Homily, but throws back the sin

[u] Homily against Wilful Rebellion, pt. vi. p. 545. ed. Oxf. 1822. A Rubric for this day enjoins, that "if there be no Sermon, one of the six Homilies against Rebellion shall be read."

higher. "Shall subjects," it says[x], "obey valiant, stout, wise, and good princes, and contemn, disobey, and rebel—against undiscreet and evil governors? God forbid!—shall the subjects both by their wickedness provoke God, for their deserved punishment, to give them an undiscreet or evil prince, and also rebel against him and withal against God, who for the punishment of their sins did give them such a prince?"—And then it lays up, as it were, for future use, the remedy I have now been insisting on. "If[y] we will have an evil prince (when God shall send such a one) taken away, and a good in his place, let us take away our wickedness, which provoketh God to place such a one over us, and God will either displace him, or of an evil prince make him a good prince, so that we first will change our evil into good—Else for subjects to deserve through their sins to have an evil prince and then to rebel against him, were double and treble evil, by provoking God more to plague them. Nay let us either deserve to have a good prince, or let us patiently suffer and obey such as we deserve." The Homily seems prophetically to have traced the line, on which we ought to have trodden, the blessings which promised to follow it, and the evils which ensued from forsaking it. And for the pretence of religion, as the Romish alone hitherto had been upheld by such means, it says[z], "what a religion

[x] Homily against Wilful Rebellion, pt. i. p. 511, 2.
[y] Ib. p. 512, 3. [z] Ib. pt. iv. p. 534, 5.

it is, that such men by such means would restore, may easily be judged; even as good a religion surely, as rebels be good men and obedient subjects, and as rebellion is a good mean of redress and reformation, being itself the greatest deformation[a] of all that may possibly be."

Not so, again, the early Church; they resisted not evil; the whole city of Alexandria petitioned Julian to retain their Bishop, the saintly Athanasius, but rebelled not; the Christians of Gaul invited not the Barbarians to interfere and save them; the Christians held the balance of the Empire in their hands, yet even then took the fiercest of the ten persecutions patiently; the Christians of Persia implored not the Christian Emperors of Rome to interfere with armed force against those into whose hands God had given them to try them; "they were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might

[a] Montaigne has a passage remarkably according with the language and sentiments of the Homilies, Essais, l. iii. c. 12. After denying that there could be any evil in a government, which should be cured by a drug so deadly, he says, "*What impiety is it, not to look for, from God, any aid simply His, and without our cooperation.* I often marvel, whether among so many, who trouble themselves with these necessities of the State, there was ever one, of intellect so weak, as to be in good earnest persuaded, that he was promoting a *reformation* by the worst of *deformations;* that he was advancing towards his own salvation, by the most direct causes which we have of a most certain damnation, that overthrowing the state, magistracy, and the laws, under the guardianship of which God has placed him—he can render any aid to the all-holy tenderness and justice of the Divine Law."

attain a better resurrection," and so in God's good time, the giant statue crumbled in its very base, and the stone cut out without hands "filled the earth."

Not so, lastly, holy Scripture, which that Church well understood. If slaves were to obey "froward masters," much more, argues our Homily[b], ought subjects "sharp and rigorous princes." Scripture bids us obey princes "not only for wrath but for conscience sake;" it knows not our subtle distinctions of "social compact[c];" it bids us peremptorily

[b] l. c. pt. i. p. 509.

[c] This is, in these days, assumed as an axiom, as men's wont is, when they give themselves little pains to understand their own principles: the strong contrary statements of Bishop Sanderson may cause some to re-consider their views. "As for those in the next place that would derive the original of all Government from the People by way of pact or contract: it may suffice to say, that they take that for granted which never yet was proved, nor (I dare say) will ever be proved while the world standeth, either from Scripture, Reason, or History. Jus gladii, the right and power of the sword (which is really the Sovereign Power) belongeth, we know, to kings, but it is by the ordinance of God, not the donation of the people: for he beareth the sword (St. Paul telleth us) as God's minister, from Whom he received it; and not as the people's minister, who had no right to give it because they never had it themselves. If any shall say they had, the proof lieth on their part, to shew how they came by it; whether God gave it them, or they took it themselves. If God gave it them, let it be made appear when and where the first grant was made; let some evidence be produced to justify the claim, or at least some credible testimony, or frequent presumption to render it probable that there was some such thing done, though the records be lost. If none of all this can be done, it remaineth, that if they had it, they

obey kings, and what kings[d]? what compact, not with their subjects, but with human nature itself, had not Caligula and Claudius and Nero broken? and it may be God gave the Roman Empire such prodigies of wickedness then, that Christians might have no excuse to rebel. No one can doubt but that S. Paul would have taken his lot with our outcast Bishops; and if this be so obvious that one dare scarcely put the case from this place, how dare we call that "glorious" which he would have condemned? Had it been glorious, "to God's name should have been the praise, for His mercy and truth's sake;" but now since it was men's act, they take to themselves the glory, when all was God's "undeserved mercy," and glory in their shame. Rather let us take to ourselves the shame, and give to God the glory, for not having "dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities;" let us thank Him for His "great and undeserved mercies."

took it. And if they so did, it was saucily and sacrilegiously done at the first; and by our Saviour's presage, (Matt. xxvi. 52.) like enough to prosper with them accordingly at the last." Bishop Sanderson's preface to Archbishop Usher's Power of the Prince, sect. 15. After which he proceeds to expose several of the difficulties involved in the assumption.

[d] "This (1 Tim. ii. 1, &c.) is S. Paul's counsel. And who, I pray you, was prince over the most part of Christians when God's Holy Spirit by S. Paul's pen gave them this lesson? Forsooth Caligula, Claudius, or Nero; who were not only no Christians but pagans, and also either foolish rulers, or most cruel tyrants." Homilies, ib. p. i. p. 513.

If ever these lessons were of moment, they seem likely to be so now, and we have reason to thank God for His Providence in so connecting the events of these two days, that their commemoration should be a yearly warning to us, in a way which they who appointed the latter festival[e] thought not of. What times are coming upon the earth, we know not, but the general expectation of persons of all characters in all nations is an instinct implanted by God to warn us of a coming storm. Not one nation only, but all; not one class of thinkers, but all; they who fear and they who hope, and who fear and hope things opposite; they who are immersed in their worldly schemes, and they who look for some "coming of God's kingdom;" they who watch this world's signs and they who watch for the next, alike have their eyes intently fixed on somewhat which is coming, though whether it be the vials of His wrath, or the glories of His kingdom, or whether the one shall be the herald to the other, none can tell. They who can calculate what is likely, speak of it; they who cannot, *feel* its coming; the spirits of the unseen world seem to be approaching to us, and "awe comes on us, and trembling, which maketh all the bones to shake[f]," "all nations

[e] It was appointed not by, but rather against, the Church, and used as an instrument of oppression to her, a snare to the consciences of her ministers, and a political test against men who would have yielded a peaceable obedience.

[f] Job iv. 14, 15.

are shaken[g];" the sound, which for these many years has been heard and spoken of from this place[h], has been waxing louder and louder, and spreading wider: there is "upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth[i]." Times of trouble there have been before; but such a time in which every thing every where tends in one direction, to one mighty struggle of one sort, of faith with infidelity, lawlessness with rule, Christ with Antichrist, there seems never to have been till now. The ancient images of Antichrist are growing old, and decaying; and a more fearful Antichristian power, that of popular lawlessness, which maketh its will its God, and will own neither God nor man but its own rule, seems to be held in, not by the weak threads of human rule, which it would snap "as flax burnt by the fire," but by the Almighty power of God, discovering His might in human weak-

[g] Haggai, ii. 7.

[h] The writer recollects in younger years, how, before any overt public act had taken place, such as must force upon men's minds the expectation of further changes, persons were, in this place, warned that evil times were coming, that the clouds were gathering, that there was a diseased tone in the public feeling, a distempered appetite; and these warnings became the more impressive, as they came from persons of different character, and who had derived their impressions from different sources. Now we are become accustomed to our evils, and what then was regarded by sound judges as a symptom of disease, is now regarded as a common thing.

[i] Luke xxi. 25, 26.

ness. These are "fig-tree signs," whether "our redemption" indeed "draweth nigh," and this long warfare of this world be at last almost accomplished, or whether it shall be but some fuller image of that long longed-for coming, which shall be revealed, we cannot tell; enough for us that we have signs that God is more than heretofore visiting the earth, and that Satan more than heretofore is let loose upon it; that persons must and are taking their sides more decisively with Christ or with Belial.

Whether then this fearful conflict burst in our days, or when we are withdrawn, let those who live to share it, or any portion of it, recollect that our strength is to "fear not, stand still, and wait for the salvation of God." God hath shewn great mercies to our Church, as on this day, and those greater than to any other nation; trust we Him. Even now He seems, contrary to His dealings with all other nations, to have checked the waywardness of our course, and though we had done things displeasing in His sight, to be restoring us from the feverish sickness, wherein we had fallen, and bid us "go our way, and sin no more, lest a worse thing happen unto us." It is our duty indeed, as they did of old, to warn men of the great sin and danger of sacrilege, or apostasy, or interfering with the Church of God, or polluting her offices, or indifference and promoting error, lest we be guilty of the blood of others, if we warn them not; and in all lawful ways permitted to us, we are bound

to extend truth, diffuse right principles, as well as adorn them in our lives; but this done, recollect we, that our armour is not like that of the Romish Church, "the wisdom of this world, which shall come to nought," earthly activity and worldly schemes, but humiliation, acknowledgment of our past sins, prayers, fasting, watching, endurance, submission to men, and patient tarrying for God. Let the Church use these, use the Psalms and the prayers put into her hands and her mouth, use them not as forms but as realities, realize to herself that a great contest *is* going on between the dragon and the woman in the wilderness, and that prayers are the arms of the saints; feel that the welfare of each, his spiritual privileges, are bound up in the welfare of the whole Church, but that, besides, he ought to love the whole for herself, as the spouse and body of Christ: recollect that "the hearts of kings are in His rule and governance," and that He "stilleth the madness of the people;" pray, as our Church with the antient Church does, twice each day, "for the whole world, for kings and all that are in authority"—and they who seem to be hurrying on things with rapidity so fearful, will be found but to be bound around the wheels of God's Providence, not leading events but dragged along by them, to accomplish by their self- or free-will "whatsoever His hand and His counsel determined before to be done[k]." "Surely the wrath of man shall praise Thee; the remainder

[k] Acts iv. 28.

of wrath shalt Thou restrain." God warneth us by the very swiftness with which all things are moving around us, that it is He who is impelling them; man cannot impart such speed, nor rouse the winds from the four quarters of the heavens, nor bring men's varying wills towards one uniform result; and therewith He warns us to beware how we attempt to guide, what He thus manifestly is governing. As the trial of our faith is increased by the greatness of the interests at stake, so is it lightened by God's more visible Presence, which would awe us into confidence and quiet. The "Egyptians are behind" us, but the "pillar of the cloud" is between us and them. He will "remove the chariot wheels" of the enemy, though they drive on never so furiously. Those things only can be marred, which we ourselves mar. He would have us do our plain duty quietly, suffer evil, if needs be, patiently, and then await the end, placing our confidence not in our own strength, nor in the wisdom or numbers of any secular party, but in Him.

And let the young especially remember, that it is not by giving vent to their feelings, but by restraining them; not by blaming others, (in doing which they could scarcely avoid sin,) but by schooling themselves; by meekness, by self-command, by quietness, by peaceableness, by disciplining themselves, and by acting under discipline, by submitting to authority, even when they see not presently the reason, by acting, in their petty occasions, on faith, that they may best prepare

themselves for whatever duties, in the great army of their God, it may please Him hereafter to call them to.

In brief, then, we may not be over-anxious even about holy things, such as the deliverance of the Church from unjust thraldom or from spiritual disadvantages. God allowed His chosen people to lie in bondage 400 years, and not till the set time was come, did He judge that power which enthralled them; and when afterwards He delivered them for their sins to Nebuchadnezzar, "they were to seek the peace of the city whither He had caused them to be carried captive, and after 70 years to be visited[l]." They "stood still" till Cyrus came, they invited him not, helped him not, but he acknowledged that "their God, the King of heaven, had given him all the kingdoms of the earth, and given him in charge to build His temple at Jerusalem[m]." God is visibly working, and preparing the army, which "shall be willing in the day of His power[n];" but it is His day, His army, His power, and He must "give the word[o]." As of old the feet of the image were crumbling, the world was growing old, institutions were dissolving, but the people of God might not put a finger thereto, but "a stone cut out of the mountain *without hands* smote it, and brake it in pieces;" so must it be now: whether it please God to breathe fresh life into the old institu-

[l] Jerem. xxix. 7, 10. [m] Ezra i. 2. [n] Ps. cx. 3.
[o] Ps. lxviii. 11.

tions of the world, or whether "He take away their breath, and they return to their dust," it must be His doing, not man's; what God doth, that is well done; we might mingle "hay, straw, and stubble" with His work, which in the day of trial will not abide. "O tarry thou the Lord's leisure; be strong, and He shall comfort thy heart[p]:" "though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry[q]." "O Lord God of hosts, blessed is the man that putteth his trust in Thee![r]"

[p] Ps. xxvii. 16. [q] Hab. ii. 3. [r] Ps. lxxxiv. 13.

O Lord, we beseech Thee to keep Thy Church and household continually in Thy true religion; that they who do lean only upon the hope of Thy heavenly grace, may evermore be defended by Thy mighty power; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen[s].

[s] Collect for the Fifth Sunday after Epiphany.

APPENDIX I.

Remarks on some Statements in the "Doctrine of Passive Obedience contrary to Holy Scripture, by a Clergyman."

The short interval which has elapsed since the first publication of this Sermon, has given room to few remarks upon it, so there is but little to observe. And indeed the doctrine contained in it, however contrary to the recognized maxims of many politicians, is probably still, if half unconsciously, that of religious people, and like a large body of sound principles besides, requires but to be stated, in order to be recognized as the truth and as having been previously, if less distinctly, held. There has been, happily, little occasion for its direct application, and so the better sort have been content to hold it in a general way, without applying it to any specific cases, or accurately settling its limits, or ascertaining whether they were consistent in admitting *any* exceptions or limitations to it, or whether Holy Scripture allowed of this. And many, doubtless, hold the doctrine as a whole, who have been taught to look upon the act of 1688 as an exception. Yet it cannot be too often inculcated, that the mind in every way is continually striving to right itself, and rid itself of inconsistency: and so it repeatedly happens, that the exception, if it be of any moment, will become the rule. In moral habits, as in maxims, or doctrines, a single allowed exception will nullify the force and influence of that which appears to be recognized or practised with almost the full consent of the mind or

will. There is danger to any principle or practice, as long as there is any opposed habit of thinking or acting, however slight. A single exception unnerves moral action, and loosens the hold of belief. Any exception to the doctrine of plenary inspiration, however minute the subject-matter, has prepared for the rejection of the whole; any unsoundness in what seemed the slightest shade of religious belief has ushered in entire unbelief; just as the slightest "letting out of water" is a token of the giving way of a barrier, the breaking down whereof deluges a whole country; or the slightest bowing of a wall is a prelude that it will in time fall; or a particle of decay in an apparently vigorous and flourishing tree an earnest that it will perish. It is then of more moment than many are aware, how we form our views upon any given point; it is not matter of historical speculation, or contentiousness about an abstract point, but an earnest practical question, whether we look upon the Revolution of 1688 as "glorious or inglorious." Uncompromisingness and unbendingness is the very condition of sound faith, moral action, right principle, consistent conduct, and, in detail, of any Christian grace, or virtuous habit; of honesty, for instance, or purity, as indeed is proverbial. One exception undoes more than many contrary actions do towards completeness. One, who admits habitually of any one exception however slight, to a given course of right action, is probably much less removed from him who is sunk lowest in the scale, than from perfect consistency. In the present case, our whole tone of feeling about the act of 1688 has, in the century and a half which has since elapsed, altogether varied from that of those who committed it; let any one read, in any common history, the account of the debates, doubts, palliations of those who were concerned in it, and contrast these with the exulting, or (which is more) the matter-of-course way, in which the "glorious Revolution"

is now spoken of, and he must vividly feel, that our principles of obedience are sunk very far below those of that time. Probably we are more akin, on the whole, to those who perpetrated the Revolution of 1793, than to the Christian submissiveness of the first ages of the Gospel; and if so, it will be of God's great mercy, but far more than man has any right to anticipate, if many of the atrocities of that last "atrocious Revolution" be not re-enacted among us, and London become not a Paris.

The few exceptions which have been lately taken to the principle of uniform passive obedience here inculcated have been such, as persons are wont to make, on the revival of doctrines, which for a time have slept, though they are, in truth, the uniform teaching of the great divines of our Church. Two or three points, however, have been noticed, by one, (on internal evidence a very young writer,) which since they have probably been felt by others, it may be well to clear up.

It is a vulgar error, that, because the King cannot rightly legislate without the counsel of his Parliament, therefore, the supreme power is divided between the King and his Parliament; and this is so taken, not only as matter of *fact*, but as matter of duty; that because the authority of the Sovereign is in some respects limited by law, therefore our allegiance no longer belongs to him alone, but is transferred to those institutions, by which it is limited; that "the Divine authority is lodged in the three [King, Lords, and Commons] conjointly[a]," and so that our allegiance lies distributed among them. Hence it has been inferred, that if one "section of the supreme

[a] Doctrine of Passive Obedience to Kings *contrary* to Holy Scripture, by a Clergyman, p. 13.

power would tread under foot the laws by which its own rights are bounded, the remainder of the supreme powers are charged with the duty of restraining or chastising the unruly member[b];" i. e. in other words, if a king violates the laws, it is a sacred duty to chastise him!

This is probably a popular doctrine, in a sense other than this young writer takes it; for men like to be under the rule of an abstraction rather than of a personal being. To be under the rule of a *person* is something humiliating; the will is subjected to the will of another; but to be under the rule of an abstraction, as law, government, and the like, is to be under no rule at all, or, at the worst, one which we can change ourselves, or at least it keeps the ruler more out of sight. On the same principle, people speak of the Deity, the Divinity, Providence, Nature, as reminding them less of a Personal God, to Whom they are responsible, and Who, by His will, rules and controls theirs. And so it seems an ennobling thing to be under the rule of laws, both because the source of authority is thus shewn to emanate from ourselves, and we are in fact but paying obedience to our own will; and yet again, we seem to have yielded up some of the freedom of that will for a more enlarged good, and of our own free-will to obey, and still feel that we need no longer obey than our own collected will approves. Thus obeying, we are not subjected to a power without us, further that we have ourselves delegated the authority, and may resume it, when we will; in short, we are to govern ourselves, not be under the government of another. And this is the object of the democratic principle now at work throughout Europe.

It is an obvious answer to the fallacy of divided allegiance thus assumed, that no oné takes an oath of allegiance to the Lords or Commons, nor to the laws, (although,

[b] Ibid. p. 15.

when they interfere with no higher law, we are bound to obey them, and it is in truth the Sovereign whom we obey in them, though legislating with the advice of that Court which he summons to deliberate *under* him[c],) nor to any abstraction whatever, but to the Sovereign personally; and that not ordinary subjects, but the Members of Parliament, i. e. those who are supposed on this theory to be in their collective capacity the object of allegiance, take that oath of allegiance; that it is accidental only that the Sovereign has to call the Parliament together at all; that there is no treason against Lords or Commons or "the majesty of the people," but that it lies against the person of the Sovereign only. The whole fallacy, however, arises from the modern misapplication of the term "three estates of the realm," which historically means, the Peers, Commons, and Clergy, but which, now that men have ceased to look upon the Clergy as one estate, they have supplied ignorantly with the name of the King, and so confused all their notions about government. But, in truth, the King is "supreme," and although he can legally perform some acts only by assistance of his Privy Council, others by aid of his Parliament, yet the Sovereign, and the Sovereign only, is the source of authority and the object of allegiance.

Again, the maxim that "a king can do no wrong," is "an ancient and fundamental maxim," and this is explained even by an eminent lawyer[d] *since* the Revolution of 1688,

[c] "*Under* our most religious and gracious Queen at this time assembled." Prayer for the High Court of Parliament.

[d] Sir Wm. Blackstone, b. i. p. 246. He accordingly retains the older view, that in 1688 the king's withdrawing himself out of the kingdom, was essential to the "abdication" and consequent vacancy of the throne; p. 245. and so does not regard the Revolution as involving the right of subjects to depose their sovereign, even on the breach of the supposed original contract.

that "whatever is exceptionable in the conduct of public affairs is not to be imputed to the king, *nor is he answerable for it personally to his people.*" The contrivance that he should do nothing at all, is an attempt to maintain ancient principles which have a hold upon the conscience, without sacrificing the licence of modern practice. The application of the maxim, so as to make every act responsible, yet to keep the Monarch irresponsible, gives rise, occasionally, to absurdities which in themselves shew, that the maxim was meant to declare the king irresponsible, but that its authors did not contemplate the uniform responsibility of any other. Practice still leaves the king in some sense free to do things, and so an awkward fiction is contrived to make others responsible for what they had no share in. The maxim implies then a higher monarchical authority, as a "fundamental" principle; that the king was free, and yet irresponsible.

A theory, on the contrary, which is obliged to resort to God's deliverance of Israel by Moses, for a "sanction of the right committed by God to a people unjustly enslaved to free themselves from the tyranny of their oppressors[d]," and to His grant of the ten tribes to Jeroboam for a proof that "all rebellion against a monarch is not in itself unlawful[e]," may proceed in the next place to justify the "glorious" tyrannicide of Harmodius and Aristogiton (so at least the blind though civilized heathen thought it) by the example of Ehud, or treachery by the inspired action of Jael, and would find it impossible to elude the principles upon which the see of Rome justifies rebellion or assassination, when required, as they deem, by "spiritual ends[f]." Far better indeed

[d] Doctrine of Passive Obedience, &c. p. 19.

[e] Ibid. p. 21.

[f] Bellarmine de Pont. Rom. v. 6. ap. Taylor, Sermon on Nov. 5, t. vi. p. 604.

were it to be at the mercy of the see of Rome in her worst days, than to allow the people to be the judge when the Monarch is guilty of a "lawless aggression against the powers and privileges[g]" of Lords and *Commons!* or of "an act of rebellion against the ordinance of God[h]." Leaving such arguments as these, let people admit teachably the doctrine of Holy Scripture, and not tamper with their consciences by abstract theories, and they will see clearly what the duty of subjects is.

"What I have said of master and slave, understand ye also," says S. Augustine[i], "of potentates and kings, and all the heads of this world. Sometimes the "powers that be" are good, and fear God; sometimes they fear not God. Julian was an infidel Emperor, was an apostate, unjust, an idolater; Christian soldiers served an infidel Emperor; when it came to the cause of Christ, they acknowledged Him only who is in Heaven. If he would that they should worship idols, offer incense, they preferred God to him; but when he said, 'March; go against that nation,' forthwith they obeyed. They distinguished their temporal lord from their eternal Lord, and yet, for the sake of their eternal Lord, were subject also to the temporal lord."

With regard to the Service of the day, the author meant to point out a sense in which those who might be present in churches where it was used, might without discomfort join in it, although they look upon the Revolution of 1688 as an act of rebellion on the part of the nation, as unnatural and undutiful conduct on the part of the children of the dethroned Monarch. It is, in such cases, best to join in devotion in such sense as we can, to thank God for those

[g] Doctrine of Passive Obedience, &c. p. 13. [h] Ibid. p. 16.
[h] Enarr. in Ps. 124. §. 7.

things for which we can thank Him, even if we cannot join in the sense in which the writers of the prayers may have intended them. At the same time it must be observed, that as at the time, the actors in that Rebellion had great scruples, and spoke of their own act very differently from moderns, and would have been ashamed of, and repudiated, modern panegyrics; so also does the Service, though unsatisfactory, speak in a different tone from modern times, and is *so far* a witness against them. The authors of that Service abstained altogether from speaking of human agency; of the subjects, who owed allegiance to James, nothing is said or implied; they only speak of the work of Divine Providence as a whole, that He caused "all opposition to fall before William," that He "delivered the Church and nation from Popish tyranny and arbitrary power;"—and the flight of James II. *was* a remarkable instance of infatuation, such infatuation as the very heathen would ascribe to the direct agency of God; "Quos Deus vult perdere, dementat prius." The utter and sudden destruction, again, of the prospects of Popery by the very means which were taken to advance it, the sudden melting away of James's power, and his disappearance without a struggle from the land, where he ruled ungodlily, were "marvellous in men's eyes;" only, would that man's sin had not been mingled with God's deliverance, and so worse evils, than even Popery, been entailed upon us! It would even seem from the language, "making all opposition to fall before him, until he became our king and governor," that the writer or writers adopted the excuse, current at the time, devised by Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, and which had, we are told, "the most universal effect on the far greater number of the Clergy[1]," that William obtained the crown by conquest; only, as they explained it, not over the

[1] Burnet, v. fin.

kingdom, which did not oppose him, but over the king [k]; and thus they set aside altogether the question of any resistance of subjects to a king. They had been spectators only of the deliverance wrought for them. As an argumentum ad hominem, then, the appeal to the Service is valid; even they who justified the act of 1688, justified it on grounds, which would condemn the present generation; they would have condemned themselves, had they acted on the principles on which moderns take it for granted that they acted. They avoided admitting the principle, even while they sanctioned the act. They could satisfy themselves that James's subjects had no share in his abdication; and could one take this view of the fact, the rest would be plain. The Service then takes a right view upon wrong data; they persuaded themselves that William was called in only to mediate, not to support subjects against their sovereign, and that James was removed by God not by man, and had left his throne vacant; were this so, one might readily take the rest of their view, and had this been so, the whole of our subsequent, and, still more, the impending history of our country, had been very different.

Reverting however to the Service of the day, the author cannot understand how any Clergyman, who has any scruple of conscience, can be held responsible to use a Service, which the Church has admitted only, but to which she has given no formal sanction, even through the unsatisfactory medium of Convocation. For himself he would prefer using the original Service for the day, which *was* recognized by Convocation, and omitting the subsequent interpolations relating to William III. It is with the original deliverance wrought by God, not with that wherein man mingled, that

[k] The lawyers, to escape the same difficulty, proposed the same theory, that William should claim the throne by conquest. Hume, &c.

the solemnity of the day is in almost every mind associated. Least of all, however, is it to be thought that the case of those who mislike this portion of the service for Nov. 5, is at all parallel to theirs, who object to portions of the Catechism, the Services of Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony, Visitation of the Sick, and Burial of the Dead. For these imply doctrines, these are wound up with the character of our Church; our Church has solemnly recognized, and we have solemnly bound ourselves to use them; our Church would be altogether different from what she is, if she had not the very expressions which are by some objected to, or not taken in a literal sense. These a Clergyman is bound to use, although it would be obviously his duty to remain as a layman, though he could not minister, in the Church, if he could not assent to them; the expressions in the Service relating to William III. have no claims whatever upon us, unless they be enforced upon us by our Diocesan.

There is another topic, which it is well to notice, rather as a protest against the habits of the day, than as at all necessary in itself. The young "Clergyman[k]" calls upon me to "explain the real sense of the words" p. 25, that "suffering may make those who are partakers of it, more capable of the communication of the merits and influence of His Passion," which he says "if we take them in their natural sense must *necessarily* contradict the Thirteenth Art." It were sufficient to refer to the context of the passage thus selected, wherein I was speaking of "the members of Christ," of His being "persecuted in His members," of "the most eminent of His saints," of having been "baptized with His baptism." What then can this have to do with an Article on works *before* Justification,

[k] P. 24.

unless persons can be "eminent saints of Christ," "members of Christ," and yet never have been justified? Or is it not then true, that of persons who have been justified freely by God, and by Baptism made members of His Son, some are capable of larger communications of His merits and the influence of His Passion than others? And do not means of grace, which He has entrusted us with, which we may use or refuse, make us so? Does not prayer? or are not they, who, like Anna, have spent a life "in fasting and prayer, night and day," capable of larger communications, than others, or than at the outset they were? What means it, that we "receive grace for grace," but that we receive one degree of grace for, or upon, another, according to our use of His former gifts? or "he that hath, to him shall be given," than that by having, and using, we obtain larger and fuller gifts? what the parable of the talents, than that God condescends to give us His gifts to trade with, and make increase of, and return to Him (it is He who so speaks) "with usury," and which He will reward? And what is His reward, but Himself? He first gives to us, who were and had nothing; He enables us to use, and by using to enlarge, His gifts; He gives them not to us as a lifeless mass, but bedews us with His living Spirit, Wherein our spirit is to grow and make increase: He, who gave His Son for us, giveth us Himself, enlarges the mansions of our souls by Himself, enableth us to enlarge them, and enlarged fills them with Himself.

It is a meagre and suspicious theology,—suspicious, because ignorant of the ground whereon it stands, and the bounds laid down for it, and so fearful lest itself or others should be overstepping them unconsciously,—which would ever bring men back to first principles, confounds the superstructure with the foundation, and forbids men from "going on unto perfection." It forbids our using the rich treasures

of Holy Scripture, taking to the letter what it saith, glorying in the large and manifold gifts of our Father, unless at every step we be careful to repeat what it regards as the central doctrine, or *shew* that we are consistent with it. It would have us never fix our eye upon any one truth intently, unless such as itself chooses, for fear we should lose sight of others; it would make us concentrate and condense and congeal the wide expanse of revealed Truth; or have us walk as in an enemy's country, guarded on all points, and looking suspiciously around, instead of walking freely, as Isaac, "in the eventide to meditate," or in our new-created Paradise, "in the cool of the day," to hear unalarmed the voice of our now reconciled God.

Yet this heavy and burthensome theology is not of the character of Holy Scripture. Scripture teaches us not, by its example, to speak thus fearfully and perplexedly. It speaks unhesitatingly of Abraham's being "justified by works," without stopping to insert any clause which might save this doctrine from seeming to impugn that of justification by faith. It says, "Alexander the coppersmith did *me* much evil; the Lord reward him according to his works," (2 Tim. iv. 14.) without staying to shew how this is consistent with the Lord's command, "Bless your enemies." It says, "by hope we are saved," (Rom. viii. 24.) "by His life shall we be saved," (Rom. v. 10.) "by the Gospel ye are saved," (1 Cor. xv. 2.) "by grace ye are saved," (Eph. ii. 5. 8.) "by the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Ghost He saved us," (Tit iii. 5.) "in doing this *thou shalt save thyself*," (1 Tim. iv. 16.) "the word—is able to save your souls," (Jam. i. 21.) "when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness which he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive," (Ezek. xviii. 27.) without subjoining on each occasion every other limitation,

which in other places it furnishes; nor does it turn aside to guard its statement, lest it be thought to imply, that man can save his own soul. Again it says, "if by any means—*I* might save some of them," (Rom. xii. 14.) "how knowest thou whether thou shalt save thy husband?" (1 Cor. vii. 16.) "the prayer of faith shall save the sick," (Jam. v. 15.) "he shall save a soul from death," (ib. 20.) "others save with fear," (Jude 23.) without inserting one word to shew that prayer doth not save by its intrinsic efficacy, or that man cannot, of himself, save his brother. And though uninspired writers may not, of course, in expressing their own thoughts, use the same unguardedness as the Divine word, yet surely the timid spirit, which would ever be qualifying and guarding what Holy Scripture has left unqualified and unguarded, and suspects whatever, after the manner of Scripture, is left unqualified, betokens a weak faith, not in the individual, but in the age of which it is a characteristic, and is in the way to lose all fuller exhibitions of Divine truth. God hath put His Spirit into the Christian Church, within us; and "whithersoever the Spirit was to go, thither is our spirit to go," (Ezek. i. 20.) with the full freedom of those, into whose hearts and mouths God has put His thoughts and words, not abridging our liberty, or curtailing or qualifying His message, because they, who will, must "daily mistake our words."

This is said, not on account of the particular occasion, (for in this the words *were* guarded by the very subject itself,) but as a protest against the suspicious, captious spirit, which measures every thing, whether the language and thoughts of the fathers of the Church, or of those who would tread in their steps, by its own petty rule, instead of the capacious measure of the word of God.

Feast of the Epiphany,
1838.

APPENDIX II.

On the Revolution of 1688, *and the principles involved or not involved in its condemnation, in reply to an article in the Edinburgh Review.*

After the above remarks were in type, a fuller and more mature discussion of one principle of the Sermon appeared, written also in a calm tone very different from that which has usually characterized the periodical[a] in which it occurs.

The writer very honestly casts aside all "foolish sneers[b]," clears the deck of every thing superfluous, casts overboard all the unfair weapons which have at times been used, and grapples at once with the question, in a way which evinces honesty, and thus far deserves respect. He moreover,

[a] Edinburgh Review, Jan. 1838.

[b] p. 390. Heathenish language, such as "both agreeing in letting off an occasional volley at Guy Fawkes, whose shade must have been surprised and gratified at the participation of such eminent associates in his annual martyrdom," p. 396. and "the doctrines of Divine right and passive obedience were in favour it should seem, under Nebuchadnezzar and Darius the Mede," p. 399. is more in keeping, one should hope, with the work wherein it appears, than with the mind of the writer, in whom there are many gleams of earnestness. Surely men ought not to familiarize themselves to speak in jest, as if they were Heathen; and without anticipating the sentence of his Judge, they should recollect that Fawkes is alive still, though not in the flesh, and awaiting that sentence. Again, they are God's commands to obey Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, which are thus irreverently alluded to. There is other language, p. 410, which a serious man should not have used.

not concedes only, but insists that "the doctrine of non-resistance to established authority is most strikingly declared in Scripture, from the total absence of all qualification and adaptation to the weak faith and cherished prejudices of the natural man," and declares "the endeavour to evade or explain it away, and find shelter under it for those heathen notions of manliness and nobleness of character, of which we are so loath to divest ourselves," to be altogether vain[c]. This is healthful language, and we trust it may be a sign of an improved tone of feeling, that such and some kindred sentiments have found their way into a publication which used to be the organ of others far different.

The writer further says, "Every human commission is, therefore, ratified by the divine precept of obedience to it, and 'every power that is,' *however derived*, is 'ordained of God,'" and that "it is no doubt true, that it will not become the Christian to make captious objections, eagerly to seek for and avail himself of flaws in title or defects in forms[d];" that "the doctrine of non-resistance is at least one which no sincere believer will endeavour to controvert or evade[e]." Herewith then, the general principle is maintained in as ample a manner as could be wished; and were these the abiding sentiments of our educated and half-educated classes, it might seem a secondary question how the act of 1688 were to be judged of according to these principles, whether it was condemned by them or escaped them. But these are not the principles popularly inculcated, or rather they are principles which would ordinarily be scoffed at; and one act, as it embodies principles and presents them in a tangible form, and lays bare often to people themselves what they really mean under them, and moreover is taking an overt part,

[c] p. 400. [d] p. 401. [e] p. 397.

either with God's Law or against it, will, in practical influence, far outweigh any abstract principles. It is proverbial too, how acts are stretched into precedents beyond themselves; passion and excitement are no honest pleaders; the principles of an act are forgotten; it suffices that it seem any how to bear upon the present state of things, or can be but fancied into a resemblance to them. As long then as the revolution of 1688 is panegyrized, so long there will be great danger, that it will be drawn into a precedent for acts very different in degree of guilt from itself. "Invasion of civil liberty," "English rights," are terms which are just as applicable, and in these days far more easily applied, to any question which the popular voice may demand, than to those which furnished the occasion for the Revolution of 1688. A revolution would in these days come, not from any aggression on the part of the Sovereign, but (which God avert!) from the resistance to aggression on the part of a section of the people. It would have the character of the first rebellion, not of the second. The fact that a king has been deposed, and another murdered, remains in men's minds; one they have happily been taught to look upon with detestation, the other, unhappily, they have been taught to admire; and such admiration has the tendency to bring with it the penalty of all approbation of unlawful deeds, a confusion of men's perception of right and wrong, and so to produce "progeniem vitiosiorem."

Each important act, moreover, has a necessary progeny of its own; which it will bring into being against the will often of its own parents. It gives a new direction to people's minds; the principles which lay variously interwoven with it, are developed, and those which were most marked and predominant in it, stamp their image upon its posterity; the rest are gradually effaced. The main

principles involved in the act of 1688, were that a nation under certain circumstances has a right to dethrone its monarch, that power emanates from the people[f], that its will is to be received as law; that the king is the "*chief*[g] of the English Commonwealth" only; that government is in such sense appointed for the benefit of the ruled, that they, not the ruler, are to be the judges, what is for their benefit. The sovereign has ceased, in fact and practically, to be even a "coordinate part of the legislative," except so far as from personal character, or a sort of unconscious respect, or having the means of more refined bribery, he may influence the legislators; it is a government of influence not of authority, and yearly becoming more circumscribed. The refusal of the sovereign to assent to an alteration in the laws which had received the sanction of the two Houses[h], would probably excite more sensation now, than the dis-

[f] "It could not be held, without breaking up all the foundations of our polity, that the monarchy emanated from the parliament, or even from the people. But by the revolution and by the act of settlement, the rights of the actual monarch, of the reigning family, were made to emanate from the parliament and the people. In technical language, in the grave and respectful theory of our Constitution, the Crown is still the fountain from which law and justice spring forth. Its prerogatives are in the main the same as under the Tudors and the Stuarts; but the right of the House of Brunswick to exercise them can only be deduced from the Convention of 1688. The great advantage therefore of the revolution, as I would explicitly affirm, consists in that which was reckoned its reproach by many, and its misfortune by more; that it broke the line of succession." Hallam, t. iii. p. 126, 7.

[g] Hallam Const. Hist. c. 15.

[h] It should not be forgotten that a popular (the long) parliament once chose to construe the words of the then coronation oath, "leges et consuetudines quas vulgus elegerit," contrary to their plain meaning and the authority of the English form of the oath, "the laws, which the people *shall* choose," and thence to insist that the sovereign was bound to accept any laws proposed to him by the two Houses. What was then looked on as an insolent and wanton assumption of power, would now be taken almost as a matter of course.

pensation with existing laws did in the time of James II. Panegyrists of the act of 1688, are wont to call it the "birth of English liberty," and the like; the very terms, which they use, imply that it has grown since. "The revolution," says Hume obviously enough, "forms a new epoch in the constitution. By deciding many important questions in favour of liberty, and still more *by that great precedent of deposing one king*, and establishing a new family, it gave such an ascendant to popular principles, as has put the nature of the English constitution beyond all controversy. And it may justly be affirmed, without any danger of exaggeration, that we in this island have ever since enjoyed, if not *the best system of government, at least the most entire system of liberty* that ever was known amongst mankind." Only Hume lived not long enough to see "the ascendancy then given to popular principles," developed as they have been in our days into what seems ready to become the most fearful of all tyrannies. And if they are yet to be turned aside from holding on their natural course into some fresh and more fearful anarchy, it must be, not by opposing them in detail, but by reviewing our own principles. It is idle to contend against the building up of the superstructure which others are raising on our foundation, so long as we are continually strengthening that foundation, and preparing it to bear a more perilous and prouder pile of building. Chiefly, however, it is a primary duty (nationally as individually) to Almighty God, to confess our offences committed against Him; and it has been annexed by Him, as the condition of those offences being blotted out; it opens the hope also that we humbling ourselves before Him, the evil which is their appointed portion may not be brought upon us.

It is then of much moment, as was said, to review the character of the act of 1688, (which by thoughtlessly

panegyrising, many of us have made ourselves sharers in,) even beyond the question of the principles at stake.

By the writer in question it is justified on the following principles[h], that all authorities, a parish constable as well as a king, are "powers ordained of God," that it is "just as plainly a sin to oppose" the one as the other, and so that the converse would be true, that if you may in any case of "unprovoked violence, to life, person, or property, grossly exceeding the limits of the power which the state allots him," resist the constable, you may the king. "By the common understanding of the constitution, James's subjects were no more bound to obey the legislation of the monarch, than the legislation of the constable."

All this might be conceded, and not one step gained towards justifying the act of 1688. For there is an obvious and wide difference between resisting even the constable in such a case, and on one's own authority expelling him the village, or degrading him from his office. Our good bishops refused "to obey" against their consciences, "the legislation of James;" but they "owed[i] to his Majesty a natural allegiance, having been born in his kingdom, had oftentimes confirmed this by taking voluntarily the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, and could have at once but one king;" and so they suffered alike under James and William, because at the command neither of James nor William would they do that which was illegal, and contrary to conscience; they would neither read the declaration which was contrary to the law of man, nor take an oath contrary to the law of God, and yet under both James and William they lived as peaceable subjects. To

[h] Edinb. Rev. p. 401, 2.

[i] Abp. Sancroft's Answer to King James, on being asked whether the bishops had joined in inviting William. ap. Clarendon, App. p. 310.

disobey a king who commands what is unlawful, and to dethrone him, are very different acts, and the ground which fully justifies the one, has no bearing upon the other; so also again there is a wide difference between the supposed extreme acts of the constable, and those of James. There is nothing which can in any way be described as "unprovoked violence to life, person, or property, grossly exceeding the limits of the powers," analogous to the case of the constable.

"The glorious Revolution," (says a writer[f], whose language betrays the vehemence of his liberalism, and which one is almost ashamed of quoting,) "cannot be defended without rejecting the slavish principles of absolute obedience, or even that pretended modification of them, which imagines some extreme case of intolerable tyranny, some, as it were, lunacy of despotism, as the only plea and palliation of resistance. Doubtless he was not a Caligula, or a Commodus, or a Ezzelin, or a Galeazzo Sforza, or a Christiern II. of Denmark, or a Charles IX. of France, or one of those almost innumerable tyrants whom men have endured in the wantonness of unlimited power. No man had been deprived of his liberty by any illegal warrant. No man, except in the single though very important instance of Magdalen College, had been despoiled of his property. I must also add, that the government of James II. will lose little by comparison with that of his father. The judgment in favour of his prerogative to dispense with the test, was far more according to received notions of law, far less injurious and unconstitutional, than that which gave a sanction to ship money. The injunction to read the declaration of indulgence in churches was less offensive to scrupulous men, than the similar command to read the declaration of Sunday sports in the time of Charles I. Nor was any one punished for a refusal to comply with the one, while the prisons had been filled with those who had disobeyed the other. Nay, what is more, there are much stronger presumptions of the father's than of the son's intention to lay aside parliaments, and set up an avowed despotism. It is indeed amusing to

[f] Hallam, t. iii. p. 113—15.

observe that many, who scarcely put bounds to their eulogies of Charles I. have been content to abandon the cause of one, who had no faults in his public conduct but such as seem to have come by inheritance.

Herewith, by this writer at least, all the ground upon which the revolution was of old [f] defended, is abandoned. It is well however to review the illegal acts of King James II, not as his apologist, but that we may have before us those facts, which were thought strong enough to make rebellion justifiable, or lawful, or glorious. This is the more important, because persons have vulgarly taken up some vague notions of the arbitrary proceedings of James II, and in ignorance of the real facts, of the extent of the real evil, and of the possibility of remedy and of the relative circumstances, they have assumed as an axiom that the case was in itself extreme, and that there was no other remedy.

"It is no wonder," says even one [g] of the defenders of the Revolution, "that these events have long, by the representations of faction, been extremely clouded and obscured. No man has yet arisen, who has paid an entire regard to truth, and has dared to expose her, without covering or disguise, to the eyes of the prejudiced public. Even that party amongst us which boasts of the highest regard to liberty, has not possessed sufficient liberty of thought in this particular, nor has been able to decide impartially of their own merit, compared with that of their antagonists. The Whig party, for a course of near seventy years, has, almost without interruption, enjoyed the whole authority of government; and no honours or offices could be obtained but by their countenance and protection. But this event, which, in some particulars, has been advantageous to the State, has proved destructive to the truth of history, and has established many gross falsehoods, which it is unaccountable how any civilized nation could have embraced with regard to its domestic occurrences.

[f] See "Appeal from the new to the old Whigs," exhibiting the principles maintained by the Whigs, in the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverel, in extracts from their speeches. Burke's Works, t. vi. p. 145—81.

[g] Hume, Hist. c. 71.

The illegal acts were: 1st and chiefly, that "James[h] assumed the power of legislation, for to dispense with existing laws was to legislate; his subjects resisted," and this writer rests the lawfulness of the revolution on this fact only. Yet the ultra-liberal writer just quoted, says[i]:

The Kings of England, if not immemorially, yet from a very early æra in our records, had exercised a prerogative unquestioned by parliament, and recognised by courts of justice, that of granting dispensations from the prohibitions and penalties of particular laws. The language of ancient Statutes was usually brief and careless, with few of those attempts to regulate prospective contingencies, which, even with our pretended modern caution, are so often imperfect; and, as the Sessions were never regular, sometimes interrupted for several years, there was a kind of necessity, or great convenience, in deviating occasionally from the rigour of a general prohibition; more often, perhaps, some motive of interest or partiality would induce the crown to infringe on the legal rule. This dispensing power, however, grew up, as it were, collaterally to the sovereignty of the legislature, which it sometimes appeared to overshadow. It was of course asserted in large terms by counsellors of state, and too frequently by the interpreters of law. Lord Coke, before he had learnt the bolder tone of his declining years, lays it down, that no act of Parliament can bind the King from any prerogative which is inseparable from his person, so that he may not dispense with it by a non-obstante; such is his sovereign power to command any of his subjects to serve him for the public weal, which solely and inseparably is annexed to his person, and cannot be restrained by an Act of Parliament. Thus, although the statute 23 H. VI. c. 8, provides that all patents to hold the office of sheriff for more than one year shall be void, and even enacts that the king shall not dispense with it; yet it was held by all the judges in the reign of Henry VII., that the King may grant such a patent for a longer term on good grounds, whereof he alone is the judge. So also the statutes which restrain the King from granting pardons in case of murder

[h] Edinb. Rev. p. 402.

[i] Hallam, t. iii. p. 83 sqq.

have been held void; and doubtless the constant practice has been to disregard them.

This high and dangerous prerogative nevertheless was subject to several limitations, which none but the grosser flatterers of monarchy could deny. It was agreed among lawyers that the King could not dispense with the common law, nor with any statute prohibiting that which was *malum in se*, nor with any right or interest of a private person or corporation. The rules, however, were still rather complicated, the boundaries indefinite, and therefore varying according to the political character of the judges.

But the immediate circumstances of the case render it the more striking. In the instance in which it was judicially decided, the chief Justice (Herbert) was an honest and upright man, (as he shewed himself afterwards by his protest in the case of Magd. Coll.) and yet he, and in the whole eleven out of the twelve judges, decided in favour of the validity of the dispensation. The exception is said[k] to have been a judge of very indifferent reputation.

"It is by no means evident," continues the same author[l], "that the decision in this particular case of Hales, which had the approbation of eleven judges out of twelve, was against law. The course of precedents seems rather to furnish its justification."

And yet this case involves the whole question of the dispensing power exercised in this reign. And accordingly this writer goes on to argue the necessity of the revolution, not from the *il*-legality, but from the legality of this dispensing power.

"But the less untenable such a judgment in favour of the dispensing power might appear, the more necessity would men of reflection perceive of making some great change in the relations of the people towards their sovereign. A prerogative of setting aside the enactments of parliament, which in trifling matters, and for the sake of conferring a benefit on individuals, might be suffered to exist with little mischief, became intole-

[k] Lingard, vii. 106. [l] Hallam, p. 86, 7.

rable when exercised in contravention of the very principle of those statutes, which had been provided for the security of fundamental liberties or institutions. Thus the Test Act, the great achievement, as it had been reckoned, of the protestant party, for the sake of which the most subservient of parliaments had just then ventured to lose the king's favour, became absolutely nugatory and ineffective, by a construction which the law itself did not reject. Nor was it easy to provide any sufficient remedy by means of parliament; since it was the doctrine of the judges, that the king's inseparable and sovereign prerogatives in matters of government could not be taken away or restrained by statute. The unadvised assertion in a court of justice of this principle, which though not by any means novel, had never been advanced in a business of such universal concern and interest, may be said to have sealed the condemnation of the house of Stuart. It made the co-existence of an hereditary line, claiming a sovereign prerogative paramount to the liberties they had vouchsafed to concede, incompatible with the security or probable duration of those liberties. This incompatibility is the true basis of the revolution in 1688.

In other words, it was pronounced by the authorized interpreters of the law, not as a new doctrine, but in accordance with antient practice, that a certain prerogative belonged to the king, which made the English monarchy not altogether unlimited, (for James's independence of his parliament arose from their having granted him supplies for his life,) but less restricted than suited the will of the then people; and therefore they were to rebel, and the existing line to be cast out, not so much on account of the acts in themselves, but as a necessary preliminary to a supposed better state of things, to make way for a more satisfactory arrangement of "the relations of the people towards their sovereign."

It is remarkable, (as it has been remarked[m],) that even the revolutionary Convention, which tendered the crown to

[m] Hume, c. 70, p. 249, note.

William of Orange, did not absolutely deny this power of dispensation, but only declared it " illegal *as* it had been assumed and exercised *of late ;*" so that it may well be supposed, that James thought himself justified in the particular cases, when even this body of men, so committed as they were, did not venture to deny it wholly, or in the abstract.

It is further remarkable, that this right of dispensation was exercised in behalf of that class, whose so-called " emancipation" was carried some years past, against the known strong repugnance of the Sovereign, through the threat of a civil war, in case of its refusal. It were easy to decide which, although finally settled more in accordance to the *forms* of law, was the most illegal.

2. *The Ecclesiastical Commission.* This was a revival of a Statute of Elizabeth, which was abolished by an act of the Long Parliament (no very acceptable authority), which last " act again had been repealed by 13 Charles II. c. 12, which, while it put down the High Commission Court, with its *extraordinary* powers of imposing fines, committing to prison, and tendering the oath ex officio, preserved to the spiritual courts the exercise of their *ordinary* jurisdiction, and to the Crown that of its *ordinary* supremacy. James consulted the judges, and was by them advised to appoint a standing court of delegates with *ordinary* powers to hear and determine ecclesiastical causes, and to pronounce on offenders ecclesiastical censures [n]." The Commission was doubtless an intrenchment on the authority of the Church, and on that ground probably, the then Metropolitan (Sancroft), though appointed to it, never sat upon it. Since, however, two bishops, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Treasurer, the President of the Council, and the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, consented to sit upon it; sanctioned also

[n] Lingard. t. vii. p. 109, 10.

as it was by the highest legal authority; it will scarcely be thought ground for the deposition of a king. Least of all will it probably be argued in these days, that the appointment of an Ecclesiastical Commission with large and undefined and even oppressive powers, is a ground for disloyalty or rebellion.

3. The memorable case of Hough falls under the Ecclesiastical Commission. It was an invasion of rights which now seem undoubted, established to be so perhaps by the passive and suffering resistance of the body thus invaded. And at the time, chief justice Herbert declares[o], "I utterly denied that dispensation to be of any force at all, because there was a particular right and interest vested in the members of that College, as there is in the members of many other corporations, of choosing their own head." Yet the Ecclesiastical Commission (in whole or in part) twice decided against the Fellows of Magdalen; and it is said by the same liberal historian[p], "Elizabeth would probably have treated the Fellows of any college much in the same manner as James II, if they had proceeded to an election in defiance of her recommendation;" and he rests the tyranny of the act on the change of times; "the right was not the less clearly theirs, and the struggles of a century would have been thrown away, if James II. was to govern as the Tudors, or even as his father and grandfather had done before him." The act remains the same, a wrongful act; but the sanction which he then had, must be taken into account in estimating the ulterior measures which it foreboded, or the animus which it indicated. James II. had taken no oath which Elizabeth had not, and what would have been borne in the one, was clearly no sufficient ground for the expulsion of the other.

[o] State Trials, xi. 1263, ap. Lingard. p. 154.

[p] Hallam, p. 104.

4. The admission of dissenters into corporations, by means of a "motley council of catholics and presbyterians[p]," "the whole effect[q] of which was to place municipal power and trust in the hands of the Non-conformists, those precarious and unfaithful allies of the court." The legislation of James is in many points a remarkable anticipation of the measures of the nineteenth century; may it stop short of the rest and of the result!

Such were the acts alleged as the grounds for the revolt of 1688, and it will hardly be thought by any one dispassionately reviewing the whole, (whatever his abstract views may be,) that they furnished any adequate grounds for the deposition of King James: nor indeed, though in some measure the plea, can they in fact, in any sense be said to have been the *grounds*. They, and very little beside, (or principally the pitiable and disproved pretext of the suppositiousness of the new-born heir apparent,) were mentioned indeed in the declaration published by the Prince of Orange; yet it is confessed on all hands, that not these, but the dread of the establishment of Popery, and of danger to the national religion, were *the* grounds of the Revolution; that is, no past acts, but a dread of future danger, were the grounds of the Rebellion. Of those very acts too, some who were active in promoting this rebellion, had been forward to partake; in Scotland with few exceptions, the proclamation of "liberty of conscience" was accepted by the Presbyterian ministers[r]; in England, the abolition of the test was received with exultation[s] by the Anabaptists, Quakers, Independents, Presbyterians as well as Romanists; and the Protestant

[p] Innes' life of James, ap. Hallam, p. 102.
[q] Hallam, p. 103.
[r] Lingard, p. 128, 9.
[s] See Authorities ap. Lingard, p. 145.

dissenters, chiefly, availed themselves of it[t]: some even preached in favour of it[u]. "The benchers and barristers of the middle Temple" and, as we are told[x], "every description of persons, the clergy, non-conformists of all denominations, grand juries, justices of peace, corporations, inhabitants of towns, sent up addresses to the number of some hundreds, in consequence of the declaration," which is now to furnish an adequate ground for the king's expulsion; and of these "the clergy only limited their thanks[y] to some promises of favour to the established Church."

On the other hand, the acquittal of the seven Bishops, and the fair choice of the jury, shewed that, however James might deem himself entitled to remove judges at his will, the fountain of justice was not poisoned: the acclamations, with which the acquittal was received by the army; the affecting devotion of the people to the Bishops on their way to the tower, and to their trial; and the manner[z] in which the army had received the King's appeal to

[t] "Surely without reproach," observes Mr. Hallam, (p. 103.) The remark seems to imply that his conscience revolted at his apology for those who availed themselves of an illegal act, and then made the illegality whereby they profited a pretext for rebellion.

[u] Pease and Barclay at Chester, Barillon ap. Lingard, p. 161.

[x] Hallam, p. 100.

[y] Ibid.

[z] Hume, c. 71. This has been strangely overlooked by Mr. Hallam, p. 117, where he mentions the "numerous army" as one of the pleas for the necessity of the Revolution. He says also, "above all, he would at the last have recourse to France;" this is wholly gratuitous; James had shewn no inclination to have any resort to the "hazardous" and unprincipled "experiment of bringing over French troops:" when his subjects were in rebellion against him, and had brought over foreign troops, he disclaimed it; and there is no reason to doubt him. Yet on such grounds alone Mr. H. contends that "at least the renewal of civil bloodshed, and the anarchy of rebellion, seemed to be the alternative of slavery, if William had never earned the just title of our

them, whether they would approve of the repeal of the test and papal statutes, shewed that the nation had nothing to fear. The very invitation[a] to the Prince of Orange from the association admits that "the army would be very much divided among themselves, many of the officers being discontented, and very many of the common soldiers do daily shew such an aversion of popery;—and among the seamen it is almost certain that not one in ten would do them any service in such a war." With an army, which, on the points whence danger was apprehended, sided against him, how should the king be able, if he wished it, to force a religion upon his people? Nor had he, as yet, ventured upon any *system*, which should evince any such purpose; he had indeed forced upon the University of Oxford two Romanist heads of Colleges, (in one case the patronage having been confided to the Crown,) but the opposition which he had met with in the case of Magdalene College, and the sympathy which that opposition had excited, made it not probable that he would have essayed further steps, or had he essayed, would have been successful, or been able to corrupt the Church through her heads or the guardians of her faith.

Further, two eminent statesmen of the day declined joining the conspiracy to invite the Prince of Orange, on the ground of the *absence of any necessity*. "Halifax[b] all

deliverer." *After* William invaded the country, anarchy may have been the alternative of his being king; before, no danger has yet been shewn.

[a] See it in Dalrymple, App. p. 229.

[b] Dalrymple passim. ap. Hallam, p. 111. See his Letters, Dalr. p. 186, 196, 208, 209, 235, and this so late as July 25, 1688. In a former letter, he says expressly, "all men are settled in their dislike of the unwelcome thing, that is endeavoured to be imposed on them; this consideration alone freeth me in a great measure from the fears I might otherwise have," p. 208. as of the trial of the Bishops, he says, "It is

along discouraged the invasion, pointing out that *the king made no progress in his schemes.*" Nottingham[c] excused himself from signing, pleading scruples of conscience, because he " apprehended no ill consequences to religion or the *just* interests of his highness [the Prince of Orange] which a little time would not effectually remedy, nor could he imagine that the papists were able to make any further considerable progress." Lord Shrewsbury[d], and Mr. Sidney[e], (two of the seven conspirators,) both conveyed the same impression to the Prince, as at an earlier date did Lord Mordaunt[f].

Moreover, it is admitted on all hands, that but for the birth of James's son the revolution might never have taken place.

" It was evidently the becoming father of that child," admits the same writer[g], " which rendered his other offences inexpiable. He was now considerably advanced in life; and the decided resistance of his subjects made it improbable that he could do much essential injury to the established constitution during the remainder of it. The mere certainty of all reverting to a protestant heir would be an effectual guarantee of the Angli-

one of those faults that can never be repaired; all that can be done to mend it, will probably make it worse." p. 235.

[c] Dalrymple, 232, 237. ap. Lingard, l. c. " It is evidently true that James had made very little progress, or rather experienced a signal defeat, in his endeavour to place the professors of his own religion on a firm and honourable basis." Hallam, p. 116.

[d] Dalrymple, p. 214.

[e] p. 231.

[f] p. 202.

[g] Hallam, p. 112. Comp. Lingard, p. 211. " That birth proved the immediate occasion of his downfall." Barillon, the French Ambassador, writes, " The birth of the Prince of Wales may cause a considerable change, and strengthen the Monarchical side. But the factious think it the more necessary to oppose the designs of H. B. M. and that may hasten the execution of what they wish to undertake." June 21, 1688, ib.

can church. But the birth of a son to be nursed in the obnoxious bigotry of Rome, the prospect of a regency under the queen, so deeply implicated, according to common report, in the schemes of this reign, made every danger appear more terrible."

Thus then it is admitted by those who admit the validity of such necessity, that there was no visible, no overwhelming, present, necessity, for calling in the Prince of Orange; a little patience, and the "tyranny had been overpast;" whatever is said of breaking "social compacts," and the like, were and are but ingenious theories for justifying in men's own eyes what has taken place, not the grounds upon which it did take place; it was brought about, as its visible causes, partly by interested individuals and manifest traitors, who received from William the payment of their treason, partly by an undefined, mistrusting, faithless apprehension of the future, in no degree justified by the past, partly by the able, but unconscientious, game played by William[h]; it was brought about by Him, who guides all

[h] It is a singular instance of the early interference of the Prince of Orange in English affairs, that he was cognizant of all the severities of Judge Jeffries, which brought so much odium on James. So, at least, Jeffries stated to Mr. (afterwards Archbishop) Sharp, when he had nothing to gain, and was dying in the Tower, whither he had been, at his own request, removed for safety; "he had done nothing in that affair without the advice and concurrence of —— who now is the darling of the people." (Life of Abp. Sharp, t. i. p. 97.) This application for his "concurrence" in the execution of Monmouth's followers, would even go towards establishing what "was often asserted," (Hallam, iii. 92.) that he "had a share in prompting the invasion of Monmouth" himself. This or the like conversation perhaps gave rise to the report, (Lingard, t. viii. p. 77.) that James was cognizant of the whole. It was safer to fix the odium on James. Or both may be true. The evidence of William's interference, however, does not rest on this; the early correspondence of English politicians with him is one of the most disgraceful parts of our history, and Dalrymple says, that "there are few great families in this country, who will not find that their ancestors (of whatever party they were) had a hand in it in one way or other." App. p. 180.

things, partly, we may hope, in mercy to our Church, in that He allowed us not to plunge into worse extremes, but also in its evil consequences, as a warning to us, how we take first wrong steps. The debates in the House of Lords[i] shew, that a great part of the nation were not prepared to make William king; and had not William terrified James into flight, encouraging the terrors infused by the memory of his father's murder, he probably had never himself been made king. William was made king, without the will and against the intention of the nation at large, because they had entangled themselves in a web of their own weaving, and he held the cord which confined it, drew it round, and inclosed them, and would not let them escape any other way.

"It was urged," says Burnet[k], "that if, upon any pretence whatsoever the nation might throw off their king, then the Crown must become precarious, and the power of

[i] Several peers who joined in inviting the Prince of Orange, said they would not have done so, had they foreseen the issue. The Bishops, whom James urged to sign a declaration, expressing that they had no share in inviting over the Prince of Orange, and signifying their "dislike or abhorrence or detestation of his proceedings," seem to have been suspicious of the use, which James would have made of it, and not to have believed that the Prince was really coming. Neither did they like to be associated with the Bishops of Chester (Cartwright) and St. David's. There is no ground to suspect them of temporizing, or wishing to make use of William, as did some temporal peers. Much then as one must lament their refusal, one has no right to blame them. They were also separated from most of their brethren, who had gone to their dioceses. (See the Account in Clarendon, 307, 312—23.) They had also been accused falsely in the declaration of William (for Compton, Bp. of London, alone had joined the conspiracy); and they might think, that since the like self-exculpation was not required of the temporal peers, James meant to use their declaration as a proof that the Bishops approved of his measures. His great earnestness shews how much value he attached to such a document.

[k] Own Times, v. fin.

judging the king must be in the people. This must end in a commonwealth. A great deal was brought from both the laws and history of England to prove that not only the person but the authority of the king was sacred.—They did not deny but that great objections lay against the methods that they proposed [a regency, as if the king were personally incapable of governing.] But affairs were brought into so desperate a state by King James's conduct, that it was not possible to propose a remedy, which might not be justly excepted to. But they thought *their expedient would take in the greatest*, as well as the best part of the nation, whereas all other expedients gratified a republican party, composed of the dissenters and of men of no religion, who hoped now to see the Church ruined, and the government set upon such a bottom, as that we should have only a titular king, who, as he had his power from the people, so should be accountable to them for the exercise of it, and should forfeit it at their pleasure. The much greater part of the House of Lords was for this, and so was about a third part of the House of Commons. The greatest part of the Clergy declared themselves for it."

This feeling seems even to have increased as time went on; "there was an ill-humour," drops Burnet incidentally, "*already spreading itself through the nation*, and through the Clergy," i. e. persons were already recovering from the surprise in which they had been plunged, beginning to see that they had entered upon a more perilous course than they were aware, doubtful about its issue, and discontented with its authors. And this probably determined William at last to break silence, and by declining the regency, or any thing short of the crown, to open people's eyes, and shew them that they had no alternative, but that of accepting his terms, or recalling James: for whom could they make Regent? The vote of the Commons mem-

bers of the Convention, declaring the throne vacant, was rejected by eleven in the Lords; " but it was impossible," says Hume, " for the public to remain long in the present situation. The perseverance therefore of the lower house [of Convention] obliged the Lords to give way." To this may be added, that the House of Lords, then as on most cases of excitement, probably most truly represented the permanent sentiments of the people; the lower house of Convention, moreover, was put together, by chance, from surviving members of the Parliament of Charles II, and the Mayor, Aldermen, and fifty of the Common Council, which, towards the close of Charles II. reign, " was[1] entirely in the hands of the malcontents," and whose temper was not likely to have been improved by the forfeiture of their charter, even though taken from them under Charles by law, and restored to them when, just before the invasion, James redressed all grievances. So little ground is there then for all boast about the Revolution of 1688, which was finally carried, because those who wished to make a tool of William, were taken in their own craftiness by one craftier than they.

Thus far then, it appears, I think, that the alleged justification of the act of 1688 fails, 1. because it was not on those principles that it, in fact, proceeded; but from an unreasonable panic on the part of the nation and treachery in individuals. 2. Because no case can be made out of such magnitude as to justify the application of those principles, even supposing those principles to be true. 3. The farthest to which these principles would in any case go would be a passive resistance, a refusal to obey the king against the laws, (as did our seven Bishops,) not aggression upon him or his expulsion.

[1] Hume, c. 59.

The writer in question remarkably confuses these two last points, resistance and aggression, and on that confusion rests his argument; he says[m]:

> The members of that council [the Convention] met in fear and uncertainty; they, too, were determined on resistance, but it was long ere they decided on its consequences; and at last, whether through their fear of anarchy, or their passions, or their interests, the hand of Providence brought William to the throne, and the great change ended in the dethronement of a king and subversion of a dynasty. With the justification of each particular step in the change—of the forced abdication—of the assembling of the informal convention, and so forth—whether each was just, or expedient, or religious—we have nothing here to do. Nor are we at all concerned with the characters and motives of the actors in that revolution.—The only important question of conscience is, as Dr. Pusey will agree with us, whether James's subjects had a right to resist him; a question involving the right of resistance to usurped authority in all generations.

But the question as here put, is ambiguous, and that upon which it turns, is glossed over; the question is not simply whether James's subjects had a right to *resist* him; but if this be granted, *what sort of resistance* they had a right to offer, refusal simply to concur in single unlawful acts, and to execute unlawful commands, or violence to his person and majesty—whether they had a right to *expel* him, or to offer that sort of resistance which would end in his expulsion. The points, with which it is said that we have nothing to do, are every thing in this question, or rather chiefly that one, which our homilies so remarkably condemn, and in which all the rest are involved, the calling in a foreign power, not simply as a mediator, but as an invader, with an armed force, against their own sovereign. It may be, after this, there was no retreat; and

[m] Edinb. Rev. p. 403.

those who invited the invader must have been involved in a civil war, Englishmen against Englishmen, and made our country the theatre of foreign war, the French against the Dutch, had James thought right to use the same means to defend his throne, as some of his subjects did to overthrow it; but this only further illustrates the evil of the first measure. If, as some moderns have contended[n], every step was linked to the former, so that after William's landing there was no alternative, if James's recall of his obnoxious measures was too late, and there was no "locus pœnitentiæ" for a king, then clearly we are to view the first action in the full concentrated light of all which succeeded it, not glide smoothly over them, as if they were involuntary. So it is with the latter stages of most sin; it is at least in this sense, involuntary; they who perpetrate it, feel compunction at it, hesitate, shrink from it, but do it; because they have "sold themselves to do wickedness" by their first act, and they are no longer their own masters, but slaves.

The excuse "they were determined on resistance,—and at last the hand of Providence brought William to the throne," somewhat resembles that offered by a saint of God, in the one unrighteous action, to which he was led by compromising with a rebellious people; "They gave me the gold; then I cast it into the fire; and there came out this calf[o]." But the excuse availed him not; "The Lord," said Moses to the people, "was very angry with Aaron to have destroyed him[p]."

Nor can it be conceded that the motives and characters of the actors in this Revolution are to be passed over, as irrelevant; certainly not by one who would justify that act. For if there was (as there indeed was) a miserable duplicity, and self-interest, and private revenge, in many of the

[n] Hallam, p. 117, 118. [o] Exodus xxxii. 24. [p] Deut. ix. 19.

contrivers of that act, this, in itself, goes far to stamp the act itself, and to afford a presumption, that they involved the nation in it without reference to principle or Christian duty. Again, the falsehoods employed, both as to the supposititiousness of the Prince of Wales, and the objects of the Prince of Orange's coming, belong not to a righteous cause. They who acted from private motives were traitors, and this is but an ill element towards a "glorious," or if it did not at once sound as a contradiction, a Christian revolution.

And so, even waving for a time the peremptory duty of submission to authority, it will appear from the precipitancy of the act, how very far from a Christian act this was. What patience had been shewn? what forbearance? what endeavour to remonstrate with the king? what intervening step between flattery and rebellion? what fulfilment of the law, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault?" Rather, the king had been inveigled to the brink of the precipice; in 1687, in[q] "his progress from London to Bath and thence to Chester, he was received with acclamations;" "the king," says the observant French embassador[r], "believes that his journey has served to bring back men's minds to him, and that the people have been undeceived as to many falsehoods;" "the singular contrast between the addresses, sent up to him in that year (1687,) and what we know of the prevailing disposition of the people in that year, and of their general abandonment of the King's cause before the end of the

[q] Lingard, p. 161.

[r] Barillon, ib. p. 163. Two letters of King James to the Prince of Orange, April and May, 1687, express, he "finds his Declaration contributes much to things being so quiet, the generality of the nation being satisfied with it, and at ease by it." ap. Dalrymple, App. p. 182, 3.

next" has been noticed by an Apologist[s] of the revolution, so that he says " we should have cause to blush for the servile hypocrisy of our ancestors, if there were not good reason to believe that these addresses were *sometimes* the work of a small minority in the name of the rest." This, if true, would so far excuse some members of a class; it does not excuse the nation; the University of Oxford, which was aggrieved, openly avowed herself aggrieved, and for so doing she was (and with her, the Church) taunted[t] for inconsistency and " apostasy from their professions:" of the King's other acts the Clergy alone[u] conveyed their disapprobation. And this then we are to suppose such intolerable servitude, that it required the desperate remedy of calling in an invader, and rebelling against the lawful sovereign! Truly it is more like the act of an assassin, who with fair speeches should lead on a person to the ambush set for his life, than that of a Christian people. Be it that in the case of the seven Bishops, James shewed himself little inclined to yield even to respectful remonstrance, yet by them he had been disobeyed; they had declared the measure of the sovereign illegal; and so he thought himself aggrieved: but what if others had done like them? what, had the people remonstrated instead of flattering? James issued orders[x] indeed " to prosecute all those clergymen, who had not read his declaration i. e. the whole church of England, 200 excepted;" but such resolves betray passion only, and can never issue in any result except the disgrace and defeat of him who engages in them; a whole people has always the means of self-redress against the permanent pressure of things unjust, by abstaining tranquilly from complying with them; or if there be risk in some cases to individuals—and

[s] Hallam, p. 100. [t] Id. p. 107 and note. [u] Id. p. 100.
[x] Hume, c. 70.

every thing valuable is to be purchased by the sufferings of the few, who are called to the more prominent posts,—what was this to be accounted of? In this case, it appeared too, from the result of the trial of the Bishops, that a little temporary inconvenience alone was the result; and, after their trial, James, although he used angry words, tried the issue no further. Poor and mean then were the attainments of Christian patience and endurance, were such as these its legitimate bounds! When, moreover, King James saw that his people did in earnest desire an alteration in his line of conduct, he altered it; the first intimation he received that it was displeasing to his subjects was the notice that the armaments of William were intended against him, and that William had been invited by some of his own subjects; but above a month before the Prince of Orange landed, he had begun to revoke the obnoxious measures; and before he sailed, every thing was restored to its former footing, every trace of misrule effaced[y]; and his acts, for they were not mere promises, were accepted "with the usual demonstrations of public joy[z]." "It was pity," said Lord Clarendon shortly before to the Princess his daughter and ultimate successor[a], "that nobody would take this opportunity of speaking freely and honestly to the King;" but it was a readier way to betray him.

Such then having been the case, the rebellion of 1688 is, obviously, wholly unjustifiable on the most ordinary principles of Christian morality, without having recourse to any of the higher doctrines of non-resistance, or the more difficult trials of Christian principle. And in the rest of the subject we may lay aside all reference to that

[y] See Clarendon's Diary and authorities ap. Lingard, p. 227.
[z] Ib. p. 228.
[a] Diary, p. 68.

event, and speak of the principle only, in order to clear our own views of Christian obedience in itself.

The resistance to the supreme authority of a state, has been defended by a sort of common-sense-appeal, "you[b] would in such or such a case surely resist a constable, and since his authority is also from God, if you may resist the lowest, you may also the highest." Bearing in mind the fallacy above stated[c], and that resisting a constable and ejecting a constable, resisting a king or not complying with unlawful commands, and deposing a king, are not one and the same thing, there are yet other points in which this supposed analogy between the highest and lowest authority fails.

1. It is obvious that the ground of resisting the constable, in any such extreme case as is supposed, lies in the *instant* necessity of the case. When violence is offered to life, if the authority be not resisted *then*, it is too late. There is a fallacy in selecting the instance out of just that class, in which physical force is necessarily employed. The analogy would not have held of a judge. Nor had any life been threatened or endangered by the measures of King James. 2. The lowest authority does not derive his power *directly* from God, but mediately through other authorities. We have then interpreters of the authority given to him; his authority is limited by the higher human authority, which delegated it; so that in resisting him, when violating his authority, we are executing the authority which the same source of authority has given to us. We are acting in obedience to the higher authority in resisting the lower. The king we are bid to obey "as supreme[d]," i. e. not deriving his authority from any earthly power, but directly from God, and being the channel through which

[b] Edinb. Rev. p. 401. [c] p. 80, l. [d] 1 Pet. ii. 13.

power is conveyed to inferior authorities. 3. There is no danger of any ulterior confusion in resisting the lower authority; we do it, at our own responsibility, but as being answerable to a higher human authority for our actions. No further evil can result beyond that involved in any resistance whatever. But a nation, or as it always is, part of a nation, when it rebels, risks bringing the most hideous miseries and brutalities on those who would gladly live at peace, causing innocent blood to be shed, and sending souls unprepared to their account. There are then, obviously, reasons why God may in His goodness have enjoined *absolute submission* to the supreme authority of the state, even though in some cases that owed to inferior authorities may be dispensed with. But in fact, absolute submission has been peremptorily commanded to *all* human authority, except when the law of God intervenes; and in any such extreme cases, in which men are called upon actively to resist the inferior, they are in fact obeying the superior. "We ought to choose to serve the higher," says S. Aug. No exception then is made out; and so it were well that men should reverently weigh the aweful words, the more aweful as coming at the close of the Epistle which so largely discourses of God's mercy in Christ, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God; so then he who resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God; AND THEY WHO RESIST SHALL RECEIVE TO THEMSELVES DAMNATION." We have nothing to do with dispensing God's judgments; but we may, at least, on the other side, beware the sentence against those, "who knowing the judgments of God that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, *but have pleasure* in them that do them."

Nor will the distinction alleged[e] between the Roman Emperors whom S. Paul commanded to obey, and the supreme but limited authority in modern states, avail any thing. And that on two grounds; 1. that there is no proof of the alleged compact; 2. that Scripture commands men to obey not legal only, but illegal authority. It were indeed very dangerous to leave it to the subject to determine, when or under what circumstances the Sovereign broke his coronation oath, and thereby according to this theory absolved them from their allegiance. It is known that George III. regarded an act, which afterwards received the royal assent, as contrary to that oath, i. e. according to this view, (which, since 1688, may be alleged with much more force,) contrary to that compact, on which the Sovereign held his throne. His words, when pressed by Mr. Pitt upon that subject, are well known, "I can go back to Hanover, but I cannot break my oath." There was no doubt also that the act was displeasing to the vast majority of the English nation; they who carried it did not venture to appeal to a fresh and "free Parliament;" it was a revolution, as great in its effects as that of 1688, considered as such. What then could these theorists have said, against a declaration on the part of a convention, that "— having endeavoured to subvert the constitution of the kingdom, by breaking the original contract between king and people, has abdicated or forfeited the government, and that the throne is thereby vacant?"

Even they could hardly hold, (holding as they do that the House of Commons are the delegates of the people,) that the Houses of Parliament could, against the will of the people, with whom the compact was made, absolve the Sovereign from his oath; most (with George III.) would think that they could not, with it. This is in-

[e] Edinb. Rev. p. 407.

stanced, only as a recent tangible case to illustrate the danger of any such principles; the oath is the only ground upon which the alleged compact can be maintained; its terms are necessarily large and broad; it would be difficult to prove that James broke it, and so that he broke the compact at all; the proof might make the throne of any monarch precarious,—except that the way in which that compact, since the revolution, would be broken, would be only to the grief of "those who are quiet in the land," who pray for kings and resist them not. But in truth the oath is an oath to God, not a compact with man; towards man, "the king can do no wrong;" he is responsible, and not the less, but the more awefully responsible, because responsible to God only, the "King of kings, and Lord of lords, and *only* Ruler of princes."

The king, indeed, at his Coronation, solemnly promises[f]

[f] The following was the oath taken by James and Charles I, which was not altered before the Revolution. 1. "Sir, Will you grant and keep, and by your oath confirm to the people of England, the laws and customs to them granted by the Kings of England, your lawful and religious predecessors; and especially the laws, customs, and franchises, granted to the Clergy and to the people by the glorious King St. Edward your Predecessor? 2. Sir, Will you keep to the Church of God, the Clergy, and people, peace and concord in God entirely, according to your power? 3. Sir, Will you to your power cause law, justice, and discretion in mercy and truth to be executed in all your judgments? 4. Sir, Will you grant to hold and keep the laws and rightful customs, which the commonalty of your kingdom have, and to defend and uphold them to the honour of God so much as in you lye?" (Prynne's Signal Loyalty of God's true saints towards their kings, ii. 269, printed from the originals.) After the Revolution, the first was altered thus, "Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the people of this kingdom of England, and the dominions thereto belonging, according to the *statutes in parliament agreed on*, and the laws and customs of the same?" The second was omitted. In the third, the word "discretion" only is omitted. For the fourth, is substituted "Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the

to his people, that he will discharge such and such duties; but he was king before this promise; for the maxim "The king never dies" goes precisely to this point, that the successor of any particular king, becomes king without any interruption, condition, or uncertainty, by the very fact of the death of the former. "Immediately[g] upon the decease of the reigning prince in his natural capacity, his kingship of imperial dignity, by act of law, without any interregnum or interval, is vested at once in his heir; who is *eo instante* king to all intents and purposes. And so tender is the law of supposing even a possibility of his death, that his natural dissolution is generally called his *demise, demissio regis vel coronæ*, an expression which signifies merely a transfer of property; for, as is observed in Plowden, when we say the demise of the Crown, we mean that, in consequence of the disunion of the king's natural body from his body politic, the kingdom is transferred or demised to his successor; and so the royal dignity remains perpetual."

true profession of the Gospel, and the protestant reformed religion established by the law? And will you preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them, or any of them?" Blackstone, i. 235. The oath taken by James and Charles I, was the same as that of Richard II. (Signal Loyalty, ii. 246.) It differs remarkably from that subsequent to the Revolution, in that 1. it recognizes the king to be the source of law, "the laws granted by the kings to the people of England?" 2. And not only the original granter of those laws, but the existing king, "Will you grant (concedere) and keep the laws &c." So that we have not only, as was alleged in the Statute, 1 W. and M. st. 1. c. 6. "a change in the wording," in that the Parliament is now for the first time expressly named, but an actual change of principle. But the very alteration of the wording shews that, in their own apprehension, it admitted of question before, and so they were, of course, on their own admission, not justified in asserting so peremptorily that James II. had broken the "original contract."

[g] Blackstone, i. 249.

This promise then only the more solemnly confirms the duties to which, by the very fact of becoming king, he already stood pledged ; as, (in as far as one may compare those solemn acts wherein God is pleased to deal with us " after the manner of men,") He was already King of His people, and they were His people, yet did it please Him to add to this their original obligation the solemn sanction of mutual promise, " Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings and brought you unto Myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me, above all people, for the whole earth is Mine. And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together and said, All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord[h]." This has the forms of, and has been called[i], " the solemn compact whereon the Jewish Government was founded, in which the Lord Jehovah appeared as the immediate sovereign, and the Jewish people His immediate subjects;" yet were not the Jewish people less solemnly bound before ; God had before spoken of them, as His people, and demanded them, as such, at the hands of Pharaoh ; and they had been previously guilty of murmuring[k], tempting[l], disobedience[m] against, Him, which shews that they were already in that situation.

The Covenant with Israel was not made at Mount Sinai, but with the Fathers, four hundred and thirty years before; this solemn act was an impressive acknowledgment of that mutual relation, but did not constitute it, because it existed before. There is, of course, a

[h] Ex. xix. [i] Graves on the Pentateuch, p. ii. l. iii. p. 260.
[k] Ex. xvi. 8—12. [l] Chap. xvii. 2. 7. [m] Chap. xvi. 28.

manifest difference between a compact of man with God or with his fellowman, because "He is faithful, and cannot deny Himself," or break His covenant: but the case illustrates this, that there may be a mutual promise, even where the relation existed before. Again, the Coronation is a solemn act of worship, wherein God, by His ministers, confers His authority on each successive king, who thus becomes "the anointed of the Lord:" it is not a compact with the people, nor do they delegate to the king a power which they have not, but an oath to God, and a sanction and consecration from God to that individual.

But 2. Scripture commands to obey not only lawful, but illegal power. Illegal power has a claim upon the obedience of the subject, when there is no other higher claim conflicting with it. Not only were the Emperors, whom the Apostles bade Christians obey, themselves without any title raised to the throne, but the office, it need not be said, was itself illegal. It was a true tyranny; their accumulation of offices, and all their functions were contrary to existing laws; they were usurpers, exercising unlawful authority; but Scripture bade men obey these; and the principle contained therein is this, that the Christian subject is to submit patiently to whatever the supreme power of the country in which he lives, lays upon him, (obeying whatever is not contrary to conscience, and, since conscience cannot be thereby injured, suffering every thing quietly,) praying "for kings and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty," and living that quiet and peaceable life, submitting to the authority, whatever it may be, and whether exercised for or against him. "What signifies it," says S. Aug.[n] "to this mortal life, which in a few days is passed and closed, what signifies it, under whose rule man lives,

[n] De Civ. Dei, v. 17.

while on his way to death, if they who rule do not compel to things unholy and unjust?"

In all this, *nothing has been said, nor was any thing said in any part of the Sermon, implying the Divine right of kings;* it has been maintained broadly that a person must live quietly under the authority of the country in which Divine Providence has placed him, being in fact a sojourner and a pilgrim here, and a citizen of a better country, yet seeking the good of the country in which he sojourns. Still less has any thing been said here or elsewhere implying " an indefeasible hereditary right." This involves a number of difficult questions, into which it was not necessary to enter. For those who lived at that time, and had taken the oath, the whole case appears to us very plain; they had sworn allegiance not only to the existing monarch but to his heirs; even such, as had not taken it, had been born under the rule of an hereditary line of kings, and so it can hardly be held that the son of James II., (especially being born while his father was the acknowledged king,) was not born with a title to the throne, that injustice was not committed or guilt contracted by passing him over, that he was not the rightful king. But when those generations had passed away, and others had sprung up, born under the rule of the new line, and bound by no pledges to the old, the case was in a great measure altered; the rising of 1745 was different from that of 1715, and this again from the first attempt of James II. to recover his kingdom in Ireland. Those who lived at those periods had cases to solve of more or less difficulty; and it would be presumptuous to pronounce, that the Scotch, born members of an antient strict hereditary kingdom, were wrong, even in 1745, in obeying him, who demanded their allegiance, as their lawful king. For

a voluntary attempt to disturb the king *de facto*, and an obedience to the king *de jure*, if he reappear to claim it of those on whom he *has* a claim (whoever these may be) are obviously very different. It has been annexed as a penalty to a first wrong step, whether in public or private morals, that it involves persons in perplexities from which in a straight course they had been free; so that not only do they increase their own difficulties in seeing or doing their duty, through the bias which any such act gives the mind, but they make those duties themselves more intricate and complex. A person who has done a private wrong, very often, after a time, cannot repair it without doing a further wrong to another person. Such reparation as could be offered, would be a fresh injury. Even short of this, a case will often become so involved, that a person finds it difficult to decide, which way his duty really lies, though bent upon performing it, if he could decide. This is acknowledged even in public matters, though there is rarely there so much conscientiousness, and consequently there is so much the more real perplexity. Thoughtful minds feel that the nation lies under the guilt of sacrilege for the spoliations under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth; yet how to remedy this, after the spoliations have been confirmed by time, they have not seen; or again, to take a case of secular politics, whether, on the restoration of any lawful dynasty, they who have been dispossessed of their estates during a period of illegal rule, should recover them, or they retain them who have lawfully purchased them from that unlawful power? However decided, the decision has seemed harsh and unjust; the restored government both in France and England allowed those to suffer whom it would naturally have most favoured,—its own adherents, so difficult did it find it to adjust the conflicting claims. So also, whenever by men's own mis-

conduct or that of their forefathers, a disputed succession has arisen, the duty of allegiance, elsewhere so plain and simple, became greatly obscured; and he who should pronounce such or such an act to involve the sin of rebellion, knows little of the deep instinctive fixedness of the human affections, and would confound the mere decision of a majority, (if it were such,) with the will of God.

But the case is obviously wholly altered, when the hereditary line becomes extinct; the existence of the family of the Stuarts was a memorial against us; there was a direct line of princes, who each in succession would have sate upon the throne, inheriting it from his father; and though it might not be difficult to say, when they should have ceased to claim allegiance, it was not easy to decide, when the subject ceased to owe it, if claimed. One born under James II. was clearly bound to him and to his son; was his son's allegiance different from his own? or since the son of James II. was entitled to their allegiance, was not also his son's son? These, as the history of Scotland shews, were practically questions of real difficulty; if many could without scruple or compromise remain tranquil under the new dynasty, even when their allegiance was claimed by the representative of the old, yet many doubtless in so doing consulted their safety rather than their conscience, many were perplexed. But since the hereditary right is derived from the paternal character of government and the affection due to the king and his son and his son's son after him, it is equally a fact, that the extinction of the descendants of James II. removed all these harassing difficulties. It were absurd to parallel a case, wherein a Convention, illegally brought together, in a state of anarchy, excluded the heir-apparent to the throne, or those who were yet in the loins of the father, (as in the case of the lineal descendants of James II.) with that wherein one, *de*

facto king, in concurrence with the two Houses of Parliament, and having to ascend upwards for the nearest of kin, selected the descendants of an aunt in preference to those of a niece. The first, the consciences of many, who shared in it, rebelled at, (whence they so readily believed the heir of James II. to be supposititious,) the other is an abstract question, belonging to the constitutions of empires, but no way affecting allegiance. Still more absurd would it be, at any time after the line of James II. was finally extinct, to affect to raise any question, because the line then on the throne had, nearly two centuries past, parted off one generation higher than another. Under ordinary circumstances, it might be well, in order to avoid disputes, to adhere to a rule, even in such a case as this, and to leave nothing to choice; but it would be the mere pedantry of legalism, to represent it as involving the whole principle of hereditary succession; the objection on principle to the "act of succession" was, that it set aside the line of James, not that it preferred that of the House of Hanover to that of Orleans: whether, of princesses who had been married into foreign families, and become part of them, the descendant of the one or the other should be preferred, was obviously a different question, and one which never excited any scruple. Either were foreigners, not our hereditary princes. The line, which (if we measured the succession to the crown, by the legal rule which amongst us settles the succession of property) was passed by, has passed, first, into the family of Orleans, then into that of Sardinia, and now again is transplanted into that of Modena°. Whatever lawyers, accustomed to the technicalities of their profession, may think, they will never persuade

° In the Preface it is said "the King of Sardinia;" the Edinburgh Reviewer, who probably does not recollect the time when it was the King of Sardinia, has rightly corrected the "Duchess of Modena;" for the King of Sardinia, who died in 1824, left no male issue.

men that the principles of hereditary succession may not be fully acknowledged, without tying down the succession of the Crown to all the minute rules which regulate the inheritance of a farm. The blessing spoken of by God is, "He shall never want a son to sit on his throne;" this our service recognizes as a blessing, "that our posterity may see his children's children and peace upon Israel;" but this withdrawn, it were affectation to say that any principle whatever is involved in taking the next of kin a century or two back; any reason in the nature of things, why persons should not go to the branch nearest the original stock, as well as to that which has latest separated, the eldest as well as the youngest, the head as well as the tail. The fact, that persons were not content with the succession, so long as the direct line of James II. existed, and that all have been contented since, outweighs all such petty technicalities. The Jacobites did doubt the right of the present family before; they have not doubted it since [p], and so the unhappy distinction has been merged. For these reasons I distinctly waived the question of hereditary right as wholly irrelevant[q]; the reign of William and Mary was the direct produce of rebellion; that of the House of Hanover of an act of settlement passed, at least, as was said, "in a more orderly way." And the principles of the Non-Jurors have nothing at variance with their full recognition.

Now, however, not only has any perplexity been removed, (such as, it is known, conscientious men, and peaceful subjects did feel,) but (it may be freely said) the restoration of things to their former state, wherein they were before any act of disobedience, may by pious minds

[p] The Edinburgh Rev. supposes, that Sir W. Scott must have gone on his technical principles, and consequently have been ignorant that the present line was not nearest of kin to James II; he had better have imagined that he was not so ignorant, and so did not go on his technicalities.

[q] Pref. p. viii.

be acknowledged with thankfulness as the act of God's mercy, undoing what we had done amiss, and reforming what we had deformed: and so, since it has pleased Him that the direct line of the Stuarts should become extinct, one may look upon this, not only as removing the last possible doubt as to the claims of the present line upon the obedience of all their subjects, but as effacing for the most part, if not altogether, the blot which stained our shield. And so again, one may think that regular succession (as it was allotted to the line of Judah in marked contrast to the broken reigns of Israel) is the more religious and happy lot, as not taking things into our own hands, and reposing more confidence in God, as the calmer proceeding and having less of self, without therefore insisting that it is, in all cases, essential. This was not asserted, but rather the contrary, and the blessings of regular succession no reflecting person will probably deny.

And so, without denying that the authorities of a republic are included under the Scripture sanction, or that they who have the misfortune to be born under one, are bound to obey them, one may hold that the regal form comes more within the letter of Scripture, has *more* sanction from it, enjoys this sanction directly, (whereas others have it by way of inference only,) and is more in accordance with the will of God. And some reason of this we may see, in that the more a form of government encourages the character of tranquil submission, and discourages self in the mass of the nation, so much the more favourable is it to the developement of the Christian character. Compare the tone of mind produced by the Republican form of Government (in State, and for the most part in Church) on a nation descended immediately from ourselves, with that which in the main belongs to the bulk of the English people, or again, the effects of dissenting, with

that of real Church, education, and it will appear how much more the Patriarchal Government fosters a humble, generous, unselfish, spirit—one might say, how intrinsically selfish, civil or ecclesiastical Republicanism in itself is, however it may be modified, or even subdued, in individuals living under it. And on this ground Aristotle, whose abiding influence on the human mind is a guarantee for his understanding it, rests mainly his unhesitating dictum[r], "of the three forms of Government, kingly rule is the best, republican[s] the worst." For contrasting kingly with its deflection, tyrannic rule, he says, "both are monarchies, but they differ exceedingly; for the tyrant seeks his own advantage, the king that of the ruled; *for he is not a king, unless he is independent*, and possesses every good more than others; but such an one is in want of nothing; he then would look out for which might benefit, not himself but the ruled; for he who was not thus independent would be a sort of elective king." An independent king is the most unselfish, and the more removed a government is from kingly, the more selfish, according to Aristotle, it is, and the wider that selfishness is extended.

Again the more assimilated a government is to paternal or patriarchal rule, so much the more primitive is it, and the more does it correspond and harmonize with the first instincts and feelings of our nature. Then also regal government is a little image of the government of God; a slight emblem truly, as every thing must be, yet still enough so to have a propriety and intrinsic beauty which no other has. The republican change in the prayer of our Lord (one would not wish to bring it to the recollection of any, who knows it not) strikes every one probably not simply

[r] Eth. Nicom. viii. 9.

[s] Lit. "Timocracy," of which Democracy is regarded by Aristotle as the degenerate state.

as offensive, (in that man ventured to change His prayer, but as grotesque, as having an intrinsic absurdity and impropriety: i. e. our instinctive feeling is, that what is under the immediate protection of God, and has His immediate Presence, must be His "Kingdom." The selection of a king as one of the offices, whereby to shadow forth our Lord before His coming, confers on the office an eminence and title to our veneration, which no other civil form can possess. It has been consecrated by being brought into relation with Him; as it shadowed forth Him, so a portion of His effulgence has streamed back upon it; and commands and draws our affection and reverence.

Without then asserting any Divine right of kings in such sense as to pronounce any other form of government unlawful, or going at all into the question of "succession;" one may say, that kingly rule comes recommended to us by natural feeling, by practical experience, by its tendencies; but, above all these, by its having been chosen by God, as the mode in which He should represent His rule, by His having once delegated to it His authority, by His sanctioning[t] it among His people (however in their mode of asking for it at last, that people may, through faithless fear, have sinned) by His causing it frequently, and alone to be sanctioned by Holy Scripture, by His making it an image of that blessed rule, wherein all those, who submit to the easy yoke of His Son, find their peace. Here as in so many other cases, intimations have been

[t] The Edinb. Rev. p. 405. ventures to follow Locke in speaking of Jephthah's "articling with the people" as a proof that "the general organization of the twelve tribes at that period was neither more nor less than republican—unscriptural as the phrase may appear"—unscriptural indeed, when "the LORD their God was their king." Both alike forgot that the Jewish Government was a theocracy; that there was no power of altering the laws, placed any where, and that the chief judges were priests, giving sentence in the Name, and in the House of God.

given sufficient for those who wish to follow out what they think to be most pleasing to God. The evidence recommends itself in great part to men's affections, and will have no weight with such as suppress their affections or have them not; it implies a reverent contemplation of God's Providence, such as looks upon nothing, not even the sparrow's falling to the ground, as chance; so then, whereas the opposite spirit would argue that kings are commanded to be obeyed in Scripture, because the then governments *happened* to be kingly, it would rather consider that they were therefore ordered to be then kingly, nay and to have been occupied by bad and unlawful kings, in order that a sanction might be given to the rule best adapted for man, and all excuse be taken away from rebellion. And there would be this practical difference, that a Christian living under a democracy, should feel that his country had, in whatever way, forfeited a privilege, one living under a monarchy, that he therein possessed one. The one should be anxious to maintain that he has, the other, although he must submit to his authorities, such as they are, and use no means to remove them, must still wish that the commonwealth might revert to the more primitive state, as one more in accordance with God's will, and freer from moral disadvantages. Such, at least, must be the case wherever the Church is not co-extensive with the State, and has not won the State to herself. The Church has within herself a regal, as well as a prophetic and a priestly office, committed to her; for a real member of the Church, it matters little what constitution he lives under; for whatever there is unselfish and elevating in monarchy, belongs in a much higher degree to the spiritual authority of the Church. Should then the will of God be, that the present democratical principle should be the destruction of earthly monarchies, and that the Church should be purified

by the desolation which was their destruction, and her powers and influence thereby developed, she might, unaided, well correct all those evils, to which now earthly monarchy is the counterpoise. What then is contended for, relates to the present mixed state of things, wherein the Church is imperfectly developed.

What, however, was contended for, was not the Divine origin of *kingly* rule, but the Divine origin of *government*. That which was designated as the "unbelieving theory" presupposes, as the original state of things, one which Christians know not to have existed, and that whatever approximation to it any where occurred, was a state of debasement. It assumes the most degraded state in which we now find man, to have been his original condition, that he lived much like the beasts which he hunted and whereon he subsisted, in a half brutish state; that thence he gradually formed societies, submitting himself, according to his exigencies, to the most experienced warrior or the most skilful huntsman, abridging his own natural rights, and entering into a compact with the chief whom he elected. Hence it is inferred, that since he was at one time in a state out of society, he was free to enter into it upon what terms he pleased, and, upon non-fulfilment of those terms, his original rights returned; that power emanated from below, from the people, and might be resumed at their will.

> Quum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
> Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter
> Unguibus et pugnis, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
> Pugnabant armis, quæ post fabricaverat usus;
> Donec verba, quibus voces sensusque notarent,
> Nominaque invenere; dehinc absistere bello,
> Oppida cœperunt munire, et condere leges[u];

[u] Hor. Sat. i. 3. 99 sqq.

is the heathenish and Epicurean[x] source of some boasted modern theories on the origin of language and government. Holy Scripture, on the other hand, instructs us, as was said, that man was not originally in such a state; that the savage state is the degradation and decay, not the birth-place or cradle of our race; that man never was out of society, and accordingly cannot be regarded as entering into it *de novo;* it exhibits to us families *separating*, "overspreading the whole earth," not *combining* into societies; it derives the existence of nations from families, having in them a right of primogeniture, and these derived from a single head, an emblem of unity, and the source of authority. Scripture thrice repeats[y], "By these [the sons of Japheth] were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations:" "these are the sons of Ham, after their families, after their tongues in their countries, in their nations:" "these are the sons of Shem, after their families, after their tongues in their lands, after their nations:" and then sums them up in their single head, "these are the families of the sons of Noah after their generations in their nations, and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood."

Man, then, never was in a state, in which to make terms for himself, unless when he forfeited the state in which it had pleased God to place him. These are sufficient indications, that, until God selected a peculiar people and priests, the priesthood and patriarchal authority descended with the primogeniture; and it is remarkable how the most ancient traces of society which we have, external to the Bible,—those in Homer, still retain the character impressed upon it originally by God. Aristotle[z], again,

[x] Comp. Lucret. v. 923—1115. [y] Gen. x. [z] Eth. Nicom. l. c.

remarkably points out the connection of kingly and paternal with Divine rule, of which they are effluences. "Images and types, as it were, of the different sorts of government, you may find in families. For the relation of the father to his sons, has the character of regal rule; for the father takes care of his sons; whence also Homer calls Jupiter 'Father;' for the regal aims at being a paternal rule."

And thus God, who at the beginning created all things in One, even in His Eternal Word, and "made of *one* blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth[a]," and, when these lower things had dissipated themselves, and, by breaking the bonds of obedience, had rent the band which held them to Him the Centre of all Unity, and were severed from Himself and from each other, "gathered together in One all things in Christ[b]"—He, "the lover of concord," imparted unity and harmony and affection to all our relations by making them spring from one source. From the closest relation of a single family to that widest which embraces the whole family of mankind,—family, clan, tribe, nation, language, kindred, tongues,—He has impressed the character of family upon the whole human race; long separation effaces it not; a family likeness remains in those longest severed, and a kindred tone of mind and feeling abides, as a source of union,—(such as cements ourselves more naturally to the German tribes than to the French, or, yet farther, makes us feel more akin to the sons of Japhet than to the Eastern descendants of Shem, or the black progeny of Ham)—but yet, at the very last, there is one outermost band, which comprehends the whole, not simply that we are man (homo sum,) but men descended from one common stock, and so

[a] Acts xvii. 26.

[b] Eph. i. 10. ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, "gather together in one Head."

owing to each other not only the duties of a common nature, but the affections of an uneffaceable, inextinguishable kindred. "Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother[c]?" And not only has God bound each several relation together, by thus setting out from unity, but has intertwined them one with the other, and, in that He made the kingdom to spring out of the family, He tempered kingly rule with the affectionateness of the paternal, and gave it the reverend authority of a father, and has exhibited the majesty of fatherly authority in the glory of kingly rule, while to each He delegated part of His attributes—to the parent, His creative[d] power to give life to that which was not, to the kingly authority His irresponsible sovereignty,—and would be preeminently loved in the one, and feared in the other, yet loved also in the king, and an object of awe in the father.

"The "Non-Jurors" it has been well said[e], "believed the fifth commandment contained the origin and force of all government; it assumed the bible account of the first foundation of society, the way in which the great God and Father of all formed society in the beginning, and thus communicated ever afterwards His divine authority to the families, and so on to the kingdoms of the earth. They held in the sublimest and fullest sense that doctrine of which Aristotle caught a glimpse, when he said, "ἐν οἰκίᾳ πρῶτον ἄρχαι καὶ πήγαι πολιτείας καὶ δικαίου," and which is so beautifully drawn out in the first few sentences of our duty towards our neighbour in the Church Catechism."

It has been made a reproach to these principles, that

[c] Mal. ii. 10.

[d] A testimony of language hereto is furnished by the words παιδοποιῶν, &c. which analogy runs through many languages.

[e] British Critic, No. 41. Account of the Non-Jurors, p. 45, 6.

they are antiquated, that they have lain so long dormant. It is said;

"These doctrines went so quietly to sleep[f], that he who now arouses them from their century of oblivion may fairly be termed an innovator," "a class of writers whom the *world* had pretty generally consigned to a contemptuous oblivion."

It is a reproach to us and our people that they have lain so long comparatively dormant; but it was an inevitable consequence of the act of 1688. The "contemptuous oblivion" was that of men who had acted against a law; despised the law of God in act, and then strove to forget what was a reproach to them, like the foolish woman who "forgetteth the covenant of her God." Who but the penitent wishes to keep in memory laws or principles which he has violated? These doctrines had indeed, as has been observed[g], been much shaken by the continuance of the first rebellion, and, some time before the second, Bp. Morley[h] saw that there were "few who yet held the doctrine

[f] Edinb. Rev. p. 399. The Reviewer, with an amusing inconsistency, speaks, in the same breath, in a martial tone, of "buckling on once more the armour of our old revolution principles, which has stood the buffets of an hundred and fifty years too well to be now laid aside at the first blast of a hostile challenge, even though wafted from the cloisters of Oxford;" "has stood the rust of 150 years," he should have said, on his own shewing. These "buffets" are like the escape of that valiant knight from the men in buckram. "I am eight times thrust through the doublet; four, through the hose; my sword hacked like a handsaw; *ecce signum.* I never dealt better since I was a man; all would not do." The only antagonist which the "old revolution principles" have had to stand against, have been the "new revolution principles;" but "all would not do." Against these, they, as being inconsistent in themselves, have not stood. See Burke's Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs.

[g] Pref. p. ix, x. Sermon p. 47. and note s.

[h] "Not long before his (Bishop Morley's) death, (for he then kept his chamber,) my father carried me with him to Farnham Castle. I

of non-resistance, that it would not stand in the day of trial." But the act of 1688 overthrew what was before tottering: it was the overt act of its abandonment, and fixed our loss of it for long after. It was not merely that these doctrines were held down, together with the Church, by presbyterian monarchs; or that they were unpalatable to those, whose throne had been set up by their violation, but that men had, from that time, two conflicting duties, that of allegiance to the rightful sovereign, and that of peaceable submission to the sovereign, whom God had allowed to be set over them, to "the powers that be" so long as He should allow them to "be." This extended to all; all conscientious men (and it is not until these are compelled to sanction any set of opinions that they will even for a time prevail) however they might wish for the restoration of James, as undoing a national sin, must acquiesce in the duty of submitting to the king *de facto;* and this would have a tendency to relax views, contradicted by the existing state of things, under which men were living and acting. Action is the life of principle. To the Non-Jurors this was supplied by "suffering for conscience sake;" their whole subsequent life, and the privations in which it was passed, were an enacting of their principles, and so with them these principles abode. Those, on the contrary, who remained

was not above twelve years old, but remember the Bishop talked much of the Duke, and concluded with desiring my father to tell him from him, that if ever he depended upon the doctrine of non-resistance, he would find himself deceived, for there were very few of that opinion though there were not many of the Church of England that thought proper to contradict it in terms, but was very sure they would in practice. My father told me he had frequently put King James in mind of Morley's last message to him, though to very little purpose: for all the answer was, that the Bishop was a very good man but was grown old and timorous." Lord Dartmouth MS. note on Burnet, ap. Dalr. App. p. 289.

in the Establishment, the *Juring* Clergy, were the more injured by this very opposition of principles; they who could not, from whatever motive, make up their minds to "forsake all," had to justify themselves to their own consciences. They had chosen a part which, however they veiled it from themselves, involved a compromise of their former principles; and it was on this principle so modified, or confused, that they acted; and their action must, in their own despite, bend their principle.

It is not necessary to suppose any sordid motives in all those who retained their preferments, and took the oaths to William; even Beveridge, though he took the good Archbishop's advice, and, when he was offered Bp. Ken's not-vacant office, "said Nolo from his heart," must have taken the oaths; and Bp. Patrick bore to occupy a seat, whose possessor God had not yet translated to his rest. These must have had some means of satisfying themselves. Bp. Lloyd of St. Asaph, who seems to have had the more weight, as having been one of the seven Bishops, who had suffered in the popular cause of resisting James, although happily he only, with one other, avoided the unattractive unpopular suffering, involved in declining the oaths to William, was imposed upon, it is said[i], by Burnet. He justified himself at one time, it seems, as if the oath was only a promise to live quietly under William[k], at another, that "acquisition begets right[l];" Dr. Tenison[m], afterwards Archbishop, on the ground, "that though it were to be wished it had been otherwise, yet now we were to make the best of it, and join the government, as it was, for fear of a worse." These two theories probably comprised the *Juring* Clergy; that of Lloyd proceeding on the theory that William had acquired his throne by conquest[n] over

[i] Clarendon Diary, p. 117. [k] Ib. 172. [l] Ib. 123.
[m] Ib. [n] See above App. i. p. 68.

James, which, though untenable in fact, involved in itself so far no sacrifice of principle, and so "brought[o] off the greatest number of those, who came in honestly to the new government;" that of Tenison went on the duty of submitting to existing governments. The excuse devised by Lloyd of St. Asaph justified the oath, but was false in fact; that felt doubtless by Tenison, was right in itself, but availed nothing towards justifying the oath. The oath, although considerably modified, in that it omitted any mention of William's being the "lawful and rightful king," still involved the abjuration of King James, since, though it may be often the duty of a Christian to obey usurpers, he can bear "faith and true allegiance" to one sovereign only at once. Whatever allowance, then, may be made for the difficulties of the times, the *principles* have been justly stigmatized, which could enable a man to take an oath of allegiance to William, reserving[p] in his own mind the single case, that King James should again be in a condition to re-demand it. It is very possible that many may have taken the oath in the first instance, (whether persuaded by authority or any of those mixed motives which blind men's eyes,) with indistinct notions of the extent of the fealty which it involved; and thus, they were caught, as it were, and committed to principles, other than they meant, or drew back inconsistently. The case, however, of such as kept altogether aloof from politics, wrapt up in the care of their immediate plot in the vineyard, or (as Bull) living in other times, among the fathers of the Christian Church, and bent only upon bringing out their treasures for the use of after-ages, is again different. These may well be excused, if they paid no more attention to the difference between James and William, than St. Paul may be conceived to have done

[o] Burnet v. fin.

[p] Burnet ib.

to that between Claudius and Nero. Such would take the oath in the simple sense of obeying quietly any authority, aiding none, but letting these things pass over them, like wintry clouds which hid not from them their Sun.

It is of moment to notice the first principles upon which people act, since these will enter into their future conduct, even though subsequently modified. Had the oath of abjuration, "acknowledging William as lawful and rightful king, and denying the right and title of the Prince of Wales," been proposed in the first instance, men's consciences would have revolted at it, and most of the Clergy, at least, would probably have become Non-Jurors. Proposed as it was, towards the end of the reign of William, it was taken probably in the same acceptation in which they had already familiarized themselves to take the former. Inexplicable as it seems that any should take it who yet held their allegiance to King James, it does not appear that either the number of the Non-Jurors was much increased, or the secret acknowledgment of King James at once abandoned. There seems too much room for the insulting triumph[q] over these men's entangled consciences, as there is much truth in the concluding remark;

"The dominant faction might enjoy perhaps a charitable [?] pleasure in exposing many of their adversaries, and especially the high Church Clergy, to the disgrace and remorse of perjury. Few or none however who had taken the oath of allegiance, refused this additional cup of bitterness, though so much less defensible, according to the principles they had employed to vindicate their compliance in the former instance; so true is it that, in matters of conscience, the first scruple is the only one which costs much to overcome."

Still the oath, however imperfectly received, or however

[q] Hallam, t. iii. p. 265.

miserable the history of that imperfection, must have had considerable, though a gradual influence; they who took it in these inadequate senses, were not therefore hypocrites or perjured, but men who wished to do their duty quietly, although they saw not the highest obligations of duty, or could not make up their minds to see them, so as to be obliged to abandon every thing for them. As time went on, and the restoration of King James or the accession of his son became more improbable, the oath would gradually become more equivalent to what it ought [r] ever to have been, a simple " promise of peaceable obedience;" would thus be taken with a fuller acquiescence, and so would more fully proscribe the principles to which this abjuration of King James was opposed.

The oath also had made it well-nigh impossible for those who took it, explicitly to maintain their own principles; those principles therefore became of necessity indistinct and confused, if not debased and cowardly; and these have no means of maintaining their ground against more defined views. Those of the Revolution of 1688, although assailable from the ancient position of the Church, or liable to be dragged on into a more consistent extreme, (as by moderns they have been,) were still more tenable than any which could be opposed to them by such as had acknowledged the Prince of Orange; they had, at all events, the appearance of straight-forwardness, and those who did not fall back upon a stronger position, must of necessity gradually fall into them. Thus in the trial of Dr. Sacheverel, it was remarked with triumph, that his defenders had in fact taken up the principles of the Revolution [s].

Practical men further, (and perhaps the English, as a too

[r] Hallam, ib.

[s] Burke Appeal from the new to the old Whigs, Works, vi. 161—3.

merely practical nation) are apt to neglect principles when not directly embodied in practice. It seems to them useless to maintain or enquire into principles, which cannot be carried out immediately into practice. As soon as William was, in whatever way, made king, the present duty of peaceable subjection to him, probably went far to efface the dormant claims of King James. Claims, for the time, suspended, would give way to the more vivid impression of actual obedience. The speech of Lord Nottingham to Burnet[t] probably expressed the practical character of mind of very many of the laity, "though he could not agree to the making a king, as things stood, yet, if he found one made, he would be more faithful to him, than those who made him could be on their own principles."

Again, after the defeat of King James at the Boyne had extinguished all prospect of his restoration, there was apparently no practical end in maintaining doctrines, which could not then be maintained without tending to unsettle the allegiance to the existing authorities. Even although the new throne was made hereditary, yet to insist strongly upon hereditary rights was to maintain those of the heir of King James; to maintain the doctrine of absolute submission was to impugn the claims of the existing family. As the feelings of dutiful submission were thus cut off from the past, so neither had they any present object, around which to entwine themselves. The new line was suspicious of loyalty to which they had no claim. It has been truly though bitterly said[u];

[t] Burnet's Own Times, v. fin. "They thought" they said "a king thus *de facto* had a right to their obedience, and that they were bound to adhere to him, and to defend him even in opposition to him with whom they thought the right did still remain. The Earl of Nottingham was the person that owned this doctrine the most during these debates."

[u] Hallam, p. 124. see also on the trial of Dr. Sacheverel, p. 275, sqq.

" The ministers of William III. and of the house of Brunswick had no choice but to respect and countenance the doctrines of Locke, Hoadley, and Molesworth. The assertion of passive obedience to the Crown grew obnoxious to the Crown itself. Our new line of sovereigns scarcely ventured to hear of their hereditary right, and dreaded the cup of flattery that was drugged with poison. This was the greatest change that affected our monarchy by the fall of the house of Stuart."

Lastly, the act which had taken place, must in itself, for the time, fix the national character in one direction. Beyond what took place in the minds of individuals, a tone was thus given to the character of the whole nation. Not a party, as in the first rebellion, but the whole nation, by acquiescence, at least, was implicated, and it has not repented. It was often insisted by older defenders of the Revolution, that little was changed[x], that it was but " one exception to a general rule," that it was a case of necessity, of *extreme* necessity[y], the utmost necessity[z]; they conceded that[a]

" the doctrine that commands obedience to the supreme power, *though in things contrary to nature,* even to suffer death, which is the highest injustice that can be done a man, rather than make an opposition to the supreme power [is reasonable,] because the death of one, or some few private persons is a less evil than disturbing the whole government;"

and pleaded only for the single case of the Revolution. But, in moral conduct, the exception is for the most part, just the touchstone of a man's character; one violation of the moral law degrades a whole character; one violation

[x] See e. g. a strong passage in Burke, speech in the House of Commons, Feb. 9, 1790, quoted l. c. p. 168, note.

[y] Sir J. Jekyl ap. Burke, l. c. p. 161, 2.

[z] Mr. (Sir R.) Walpole, ib. 159. and so the rest.

[a] Sir J. Hawles, one of the managers of the prosecution, ib. p. 155. The Italics and the words inclosed in brackets are in Burke.

of honesty, purity, faith, taints the whole man; it has changed him, although he be afterwards even honest, pure, and faithful: one violation of obedience to the "ordinance of God" has changed the character and destiny of a whole nation. We are not what we were.

"The laws[b] were not so materially altered as the spirit and sentiments of the people. Hence those who look only at the former, have been prone to underrate the magnitude of this revolution. The fundamental maxims of the constitution, both as they regard the king and the subject, may seem nearly the same, but the disposition with which they were received and interpreted were entirely different.—Laws and statutes as remedial, nay more closely limiting the prerogative than the bill of rights and act of settlement, might possibly have been obtained from James himself, as the price of his continuance on the throne, or from his family as that of their restoration to it. But what the revolution did for us was this; it broke a spell that had charmed the nation. It cut up by the roots all that theory of indefeasable right, of paramount prerogative, which had put the crown in continual opposition to the people."

Not only, however, were the principles carried out in a large body into a virtual republicanism, but the event shook the feelings of loyalty among quiet people. Their obedience might be transferred, their reverence could not. A better authority[c] says in 1777,

"The state of the country is this; the people knowing it to be agreed on all hands, that this king has not the hereditary right to the crown, and there being no hope that he who has it can be restored, have grown cold and indifferent upon the subject of loyalty, *and have no warm attachment to any king.*"

One need not follow into modern times the history of this change of opinion, or ask whether research into first

[b] Hallam, iii. p. 124.
[c] Dr. Johnson, ap. Boswell's Life, Sept. 17, 1777.

principles has been indeed our characteristic, and so, whether it was our depth or shallowness which for a time seemed well nigh to obliterate its traces. Yet the developement of the opposite principles has prepared their destruction; the first French Revolution happily checked their growth among us, and the almost contemporary death of the last claimant of the English throne, and the virtual extinction of that branch of the House of Stuart, have left men free to form an unwarped judgment.

We are not what we were; but by God's blessing we may again be, in principle, if not in our future doom, and even that doom may be mitigated; principles which have been bent down by transitory circumstances, or their expression repressed by a sense of duty, may yet again, now that pressure is removed, burst forth into open day, "strike root downwards, and bear fruit upwards." The principles are deeply fixed not in occasional Services, but in our daily worship; they are not brought before us only by the recurrence of a yearly fast, but in our most solemn worship, in the Communion; "the old Homilies," in which a flippant infidel said that they "sculked[d]," have been preserved from the attempts of the Archbishop[e] of the Revolution, and are appealed to as authority, and are circulated widely as the teaching of the people[f]. It seems a sign of

[d] Bolingbroke, quoted ib. p. 399.

[e] Abp. Tillotson, who though with reluctance, took the office of Abp. Sancroft.

[f] "The Homilies" (says Mr. Hallam, t. iii. p. 280, note) "are so much more vehement against resistance than Sacheverell was, that it would have been awkward to pass a rigorous sentence on him. In fact, he or any other clergyman had a right to preach the homily against rebellion instead of a sermon. As to their laying down general rules without adverting to the exceptions, an apology which the managers set up for them, it was just as good for Sacheverell: and the Homilies expressly deny all possible exceptions."

God's favour, that we may now, without impeachment of present duty, review the acts of our forefathers, and our own acquiescence in them; it seems as if, now the opposite doctrines have grown, their advocates were ready to abandon the manure of the Revolution, which fostered them, and in which (though any see it not) their life is still wrapped up. "The Revolution," it is said by its defenders[g], "has for us no more sanctity than any other great political act, of which the consequences yet survive." The difficulties then in disowning it, are diminished; the panic of Popery soon subsided, and left the mass of the nation, at least in England, indifferent to it; politicians only, who wished to build on upon the foundation so laid, or to extol themselves and their own party, gave it a spurious celebrity; or, so long as a claimant to the throne existed, were obliged to maintain it; but it never could have any hold upon people's affections; it was a calculating affection which they bore it. It is indeed one thing to condemn the principles of the Revolution, and another to act upon the principles, which condemn it; it is a difficult task to take shame to ourselves for what we gloried in, and for having gloried in it; but it is yet more difficult to unlearn "the heathen notions of manliness and nobleness of character, of which we are so unwilling to divest ourselves." "How many," says its late upholder[h] well, "how many devices of worldly wisdom, how many false systems of worldly honour and morality, how many rebelling impulses of the heart, are crushed by this stern command!"

They, too, who would maintain the ancient principles of Non-resistance, must prepare for obloquy and the charge of inconsistency which was ever the share of the Church at the hands of the world. At first, also, men's unacquaintance

[g] Edinb. Rev. p. 398. [h] Ib. p. 400.

with the doctrine will expose its upholders to these charges, even from good men. "Non-resistance" seems to be interpreted into "opposing nothing," and "passive obedience" into "non-chalance;" so that, if any oppose what emanates from persons in authority, though neither kings nor bishops, or who have no authority as to that which they recommend, or none over those to whom they recommend it, or have authority as a whole, but not as a small minority of that whole, the principles will seem to be infringed. This will soon pass away, as people come to realize the principles, and not speak of them in a scarcely-half-understood reference to former times. But, beyond this, as being religious principles, they cannot be understood by the irreligious or unreligious; they will seem to be violated when they are not, and not to be violated, when they are. Politicians, who are accustomed to the unconscientious servility of worldly men, cannot understand the noble and free service of those, who serve Him, "Whose service is perfect freedom" and "in and for Him" serve those, and, if needs be, suffer from those, to whom He hath delegated His authority; but "for Him" also disobey them, when they command to disobey Him. Such must prepare too to suffer, for lost ground is probably not to be recovered without suffering; not without suffering are men replaced in the state from which they have fallen; and there are signs enough that they who live, must if they would "live godly, suffer persecution;" too happy, if their suffering be, in their Saviour, and in His Name, accepted for His Church.

The above discussion has been lengthened in parts, beyond what might seem necessary for the main subject, or for any immediate practical end, out of respect for the memory of those who had to shape their course in those

difficult times. For us, whose allegiance is clear, it were easy to carry our principles through in theory; but in treating of times, full of perplexities from which we have been freed, it is a duty to our forefathers to take into account difficulties which we do not share; and it may be a warning to posterity, that they may avoid the like. It were easy at once to side with the Revolutionists, or with the Non-Jurors; but the mass of the nation was neither; but felt with the Non-Jurors and acted with the Revolutionists. They had felt, or wished, or acted, up to a certain point, with the Revolutionists, and then were surprized; and while they could not go on with a free conscience, had advanced too far, to find their way back to the secure and elevated position of the simple-minded Non-Jurors. And now, it is easy for both parties to despise them; and the liberal party, whom they unwillingly aided, now feel themselves at liberty to discard them, and to trample on their memories. Yet these off-hand modes of deciding are shallow and unphilosophical, as well as unjust and unchristian; and, therefore, without sharing their perplexities, or approving of their line of conduct, it seemed but due to them, (even at the risk of embarrassing the immediate question,) to attempt to explain some of the grounds upon which they did, or may have acted. We cannot for a moment suppose the main body of the English Clergy, specially of our Universities, such as we know them to have been, to have been perjured, although it seems strange how, with their sentiments, they could have taken the oath of abjuration. But the way to prepare to act with a more self-denying consistency and clearer conscience, is not, hastily to condemn them, but to appreciate their difficulties. And if the like trial befal men in the present course of things, may God, with a greater charity of judging, give them power to act as these should have acted!

The discussion, though relating to the politics of other days, has necessarily become so mainly political, that it becomes necessary to recall to mind to such as share, or inquire into, these views, that their end is not that of present nor of worldly politics. Indeed had it not been so said[1], it would be difficult to conceive what end of present politics they could be thought to answer; for one set of men is now scarcely more committed than another to the principles of "the revolution;" nor are they who are supposed to be the objects of attack, of sufficient moment; they are but unwilling, unconscious instruments of a spirit mightier than they; they follow a popular impulse, which they cannot direct nor guide, tossed about this way or that, as the waves may beat the highest. But apart from this, not secular politics but religious or irreligious principles are the objects of the pulpit; and the act of 1688 was originally animadverted upon, as an illustration of principles under which it falls, but which extend far beyond itself, and that, not for the sake of the State, but of the Church. We love our country, because it is the home, it has been the benefactress, it still recognizes, it in great measure is, and belongs to, the Church, has long been sanctified by her presence, and may once more, we trust, be identified with her; we love it because it was the scene of the good deeds of the fathers of our Church, and is blended with their memory, and guards and still reverences their hallowed ashes; we love it, because in it "our lines have fallen in a goodly heritage," because in it our tasks have been allotted and our crown is to be won. But she is not *the* object of our affections, fair though she be; she is not our Ark, but the mountain only, whereon our Ark for the time dwells; it is

[1] "That day seems to have been selected for a simultaneous pulpit-attack, from the Ecclesiastical high-places of England and Ireland, against her Majesty's Ministers and Commons." Ib. p. 396.

for the sake of that Ark, that we "pray for her peace," and if that be bidden to remove, it is not in the deserted hill-top of Zion, but in the living temple, which is "throughout all the world," that our home is. The interests of secular politics is in proportion as they bear upon the Church, and since we know not what is good for her, we must often be in that proportion indifferent about them.

The main object of the Sermon was to inculcate, in the times which are coming upon the earth, patience and self-denial; the Revolution of 1688 was (as the day suggested) animadverted on as a signal case of the reverse, of a fretful and self-depending impatience and self-will; and that, both as an object of repentance, and in warning; the Church has once disobeyed, and she has suffered, not as yet in her temporal estate, but in her spiritual[k]; a great revolution in part has, in part is, taking place with regard to the relation of the State to her, which must, at last, break up many of those bonds, which have been entwined round her, since, and as the consequence of, the Revolution; her bondage seems likely to be unintentionally loosened through their agency, who would fain see her "sit in the dust;" and her entrusted powers for the benefit of mankind called out to a greater extent than heretofore. But, as a condition of this high and enlarged office, and of all other duties which may seem to be in store for her, as the reformed Apostolic Church of the West, probation and severity appear to be likely to be allotted to her, as they have been to her branches in Scotland and America. Severity, by an uni-

[k] "By the profanation of the *offices* of the Church to strengthen secular parties," the Author meant chiefly her bishoprics, which since the Revolution has been made subservient to political ends, and which were not before, (see the places quoted in the Sermon, p. 48. not. q, r.); he did not mean, (as the Edinb. Rev. has explained it,) of "political services in the Liturgy."

versal law which, since the fall, has been appointed to the whole physical and moral creation of our world, is the condition of the extinction of evil and the growth of good; it is the means of checking physical and moral fever, and destroying the destroyers of the future harvest; it cuts off luxuriance which would waste its strength, and come to no maturity, and even we have learnt in physical things to act upon this rule, and imitate the process; it hardens that which without such hardening would bear no fruit; and in morals we speak of "hardy virtues." These are images of what God has in His Word declared, that "whom He loveth, He chasteneth;" the moral or physical processes which we see or act on, commend to our mind, and assure our faith in, that system which He acts on with ourselves individually, or with our Church; it tells us of its fruits, while it impresses upon us that, in a creation through sin "made subject to vanity[l]," together with the sunshine of His favour, there must be seasons when He seemeth to hide His face, and "who can stand before His cold[m];" that cold[n] as well as heat, winter as well as summer, night as well as day, are part of His covenant with the earth. His secret training of the Heathen prepares us to receive cheerfully even an enlarged portion of these remedial gifts, bitter and grievous for the time, but in the end health and peace and joy. A weak faith murmurs at these gifts, or, when it can, puts them hastily aside, and deprives itself of their fruit, for it cannot recognize God's hand in them; and thus our forefathers, at the Revolution, seeing not in James's measures God's Fatherly, though chastening hand, became impatient with the human instrument, cast aside rudely the cup, which He was tendering to them, and in so doing forfeited the mercies which might have made us a praise in the earth, and fell

[l] Rom. viii. 20. [m] Ps. cxlvii. 17. [n] Gen. viii. 22.

into sin. God has let us go on our own way, and now out of our own way He is bringing, in an opposite direction from heretofore, fresh, and it seems bitterer, trial upon us; but if we abide it, thereby not a cure only for our ills, but a means of glory. How we are to act, may He give those who have the guidance of things, the wisdom to discern; but for ourselves, the lesson of the Revolution comes with great force upon us, to beware of impatience, lest it tempt us into sin, and to look to the end. It may be that, as in Israel of old, the tale of the bricks was laid upon them, and yet no straw given, and "the people were scattered throughout all the land of Egypt, to gather stubble instead of straw, and the officers were beaten, and God for a time "delivered[o] not His people at all," but rather commenced their deliverance by increasing their troubles, so it may be now; we are to look that it should be so; and take with us the example of His people, which He so often sets forth in His later prophets as the emblem of His deliverances, and wait till He shew forth His power and accomplish His ends. States have seldom done this, and so have fallen from one destruction to another and finally perished; they would deliver themselves, and so have fallen; the Church waited patiently for Him, and so He saith[p], "I removed his shoulder from the burthen; his hands were delivered from making the pots; thou calledst upon me in trouble, and I delivered thee; I answered thee in the secret place of thunder." The book of Psalms lays open the interior history of God's dealings; and sometimes recording, but more frequently stripping off, all the outward circumstances, exhibits to us the secret springs, or leads us into the inmost sanctuary of God; and there is no instruction, which it more frequently impresses on those who will hear, than this, or rather this is the uniform tenor of its teaching, that

[o] Ex. v. 23. [p] Ps. lxxxi. 6, 7.

"the enemy assails, man prays, God delivereth." The Psalms know of no other course of events, which shall end well, than this, and so fills up the teaching of the sacred history, that where He acts by human means it is He who acteth; that He delivereth His people by raising up Moses among them, or Cyrus, a heathen from a far country; that He delivereth St. Stephen to the Jews, or St. James to the Gentiles, or rescueth St. Peter, or changes Saul the blasphemer and persecutor into Paul the Apostle and prisoner of Jesus Christ: and the combined lesson is, that knowing all things, and so the interests of our own Church too, to be in His hands, we should be content to leave them there, and not by hastily taking them into our own, or confiding them to man, provoke Him to leave us to ourselves and our own wisdom. To impress this upon one important audience was the object of the Sermon, not any temporary end. "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put any confidence in man." "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will remember the name of the Lord our God. They are brought down and fallen, but we are risen and stand upright."

Martyrdom of King Charles I.

APPENDIX III.

OXFORD DECREE OF 1683.

The "Oxford Decree" of 1683 is here reprinted, both because persons have a very vague notion about it, as something containing certain ultra doctrines about government, instead of being, as it is, a careful and thoughtful document, and in order to shew in what company certain maxims, now commonly received, are found, and from what sort of persons they proceed. Collyer[a] says, that "most of the authors from whom the propositions were extracted, had either acted in or abetted the late rebellion. The Decree was drawn up in Latin by the [Regius] Professor in Divinity [Dr. Jane], passed the Convocation on Saturday, July 21, and presented to H. M. in English on the 24th." Both the English and Latin consequently are authentic copies.

The Address from the University of Cambridge, about the same time, contains altogether the same doctrine, though not enunciated in the same formal way. It says[b],

"No earthly power, we hope, no menaces or misery, shall ever be able to make us renounce or forget our duty. We will

[a] ii. 902. [b] ib. 905.

still believe and maintain that our princes derive not their title from the people, but from God[c]; that to Him only they are accountable[d]; that it belongs not to subjects either to create or censure, but to honour and obey their Sovereign[e], who comes to be so, by a fundamental hereditary[f] right of succession, which no religion, no law, no fault, no forfeiture, can alter or diminish[g].

The Oxford Decree having been "given[h] in evidence by Dr. Sacheverel at his trial, and reprinted in a book or pamphlet entitled an entire confutation of Mr. Hoadley's book on the original of government, taken from the London Gazette, published by authority, London, reprinted in the year 1710," was, by the Whig majority, which condemned Dr. Sacheverel, ordered to be burnt together with his Sermons. It was condemned as containing "several positions, contrary to the constitution of this kingdom, and destructive to the Protestant succession, as by law established." The reprint, rather than the Decree itself, probably was condemned, since the Decree of 1683 was not contrary to the then constitution, but only to that of 1688, so that it could only be condemned, as

[c] Prop. 1. Oxf.
[d] Prop. 3. Oxf.
[e] Prop. 2. Oxf.
[f] Prop. 4. Oxf.
[g] Prop. 2. Oxf.
[h] Lords' Journals, 23 Martii, 1709. At the same time, a printer was attached for printing Dr. Sacheverel's speech and several other parts of the trial.

itself condemning by anticipation what afterwards took place. Only four Bishops were present on this occasion. The grounds alleged apply especially to the second, third, fourth, and fifth propositions, so that the Whig Peers, by no unusual combination of extremes, joined themselves with the individuals, whose maxims were there condemned, *i. e.* Romanists as well as Presbyterians and Republicans.

"Those," says Bp. Collyer[i], "who blame these gentle-

[i] Ib. p. 903. No topic has been more employed against these principles, as an inconsistency imputed to those who upheld them. The Romanist Lingard as well as the infidel Hume seem to have a delight in exposing this alleged failure of principles in the hour of trial. Lingard says on this Decree, (xiii. 341.) "Five years did not elapse before the framers of this Decree were called upon to practise the doctrine which it taught. They felt its inconvenience: 'the badge and character of the Church of England' were thrown away; and the *University* made a present of its plate to the invader, who sought to deprive the reigning sovereign of his Crown." In like way, Hume, (c. 71.) "The Prince's Declaration was read at Oxford by the Duke of Ormond, and was received with great applause by that loyal *University*, who also made an offer of their plate to the Prince." Yet Burnet, the Whig historian, who was present, names only *one Head of a College*, who in the name of *some* others made such an offer. "At Crookhorn, Dr. Finch, son to the Earl of Winchelsea, then made Warden of All Souls College in Oxford, was sent to the Prince from some of the Heads of Colleges, assuring him that they would declare for him, and inviting him to come thither, telling him that their plate should be at his service if he needed it. This was a sudden turn from those principles that they had carried so high a few years before." Own Times, v. fin. So then from an historian who would be inclined to make the most of the inconsistency, we have—not *the University*—not the Colleges—not even most or all the Heads of Colleges, but only *some* unnamed *Heads*, represented by one who seems to have been an officious forward person. The University remained what it had been, loyal to the sovereign set over them, even though ill-treated by him, and for this adherence they are taunted under the name of Jacobitism. One charge destroys the other. They, who remained

men of the University, as if they set the obedience of the subject too high, do not seem to have fully considered, that the Homilies and Statutes make submission to the Crown no less absolute, the passive chain altogether as heavy, and strike the resisting principle as strong, as any inference which can be drawn from the Oxford Decree." 13, 14 Car. II. c. 3. 13 Car. II. c. 6. 14 Car. II. c. 6. 25 Ed. III. c. 2. 14 Car. II. c. 4. Homil. X. Exhortation to Obedience. Homil. XXXIII. against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion.

The Decree is here printed as it appeared in the Gazette, which is a free translation of the Latin, but is, as was said, also authentic.

Whitehall, July 24, 1683.

This day was presented to his Majesty the following Judgment and Decree of the University of Oxford, passed in their Convocation, on Saturday the 21st instant.

The Judgment and Decree of the University of Oxford, passed in their Convocation, July 21, 1683, *against certain pernicious books, and damnable doctrines, destructive to the sacred persons of princes, their state and government, and of all human society.*

Although the barbarous assassination lately enterprised against the person of his sacred Majesty, and his royal brother, engage all our thoughts, to reflect with utmost

Jacobites when there was nothing to hope from the exiled king, are not likely to have been the first to have "declared for the invader." Without justifying the particular "Heads," it should be recollected that beyond that time, it was hoped by many, even by Archbishop Sancroft, that the Prince came as a mediator, not as an invader.

detestation and abhorrence on that execrable villany, hateful to God and man; and pay our due acknowledgments to the Divine Providence, which by extraordinary methods brought it to pass, that "the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord, is" not "taken in the pit" which was prepared for him, and that under his shadow we continue to live and enjoy the blessings of his government; yet notwithstanding we find it to be a necessary duty at this time, to search into, and lay open, those impious doctrines, which having of late been studiously disseminated, gave rise and growth to these nefarious attempts, and pass upon them our solemn public censure and decree of condemnation.

Therefore to the honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, the preservation of Catholic truth in the Church; and that the King's majesty may be secured both from the attempts of open bloody enemies, and machinations of treacherous heretics and schismatics: We, the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, Proctors, and Masters Regent and Not Regent, met in Convocation, in the accustomed manner, time, and place, on Saturday, the One and Twentieth Day of July, in the Year One Thousand Six Hundred and Eighty-three, concerning certain Propositions contained in divers books and writings, published in the English, and also the Latin tongue, repugnant to the Holy Scriptures, Decrees of Councils, writings of the Fathers, the faith and profession of the primitive Church; and also destructive of the kingly government, the safety of his Majesty's person, the public peace, the laws of nature, and bonds of human society, by our unanimous assent and consent, have decreed and determined in manner and form following.

The First Proposition.

All civil authority is derived originally from the people.

The Second.

There is a mutual compact, tacit or express, between a prince and his subjects; and that if he perform not his duty, they are discharged from theirs.

The Third.

That if lawful governors become tyrants, or govern otherwise than by the laws of God and man they ought to do, they forfeit the right they had unto their government. *Lex Rex.*[a] *Buchanan*[b] *de Jure Regni Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos. Bellarmine de Conciliis et Pontifice. Dolman*[c], *Milton, Goodwin*[d], *Baxter's H. C.*

[a] Lex, Rex: the Law and the prince, a dispute for the just prerogative of King and People, containing the reasons and causes of the most necessary Defensive Wars of the Kingdom of Scotland, and of their expedition for the aid and help of their dear brethren of England. . . . Published by authority, Lond. 1644, 4to." "The authors of "Lex Rex" "Jus populi vindicatum" and others were known to have written these libels from pique against the Government, because they justly suffered under it." Sir G. Mackenzie Just right of Monarchy, p. 6.

[b] "It is undeniable that Buchanan wrote this book" de Jure regni "to persuade Scotland to raise his patron, though a bastard, to the crown." Mackenzie, ib. "it is condemned as slanderous, and containing several offensive matters by the 124 Act. Parl. 8. Jas. VI. A. 1584, which was the first Parliament that ever sate after his book was printed." Id. p. 8.

[c] "In the year 1594 Parsons the Jesuit or (as Mr. Camden says) he, Cardinal Allen, and Sir F. Inglefield under the name of *R. Doleman*, wrote a book entitled "a conference about the next succession to the crown of England," divided into two parts. The first, pretended to have been the discourse of a civil Lawyer, concerning succession by proximity of blood in general, contains, for the most part, in nine chapters, the very principles of sedition and rebellion; proved and maintained, (as is there also pretended,) by examples and texts of Holy Scripture; examples in France, Spain, Germany, England, and other nations. The English examples and instances, generally, are partially cited, or mis-applied, or not fully understood by the author.—In the year 1648, as a preparative to the deposition and murder of King Charles the first, there was published a pamphlet, and printed at London by Robert Ibbitson, under the title of "several speeches,

The Fourth.

The sovereignty of England is in the three estates, *viz.* King, Lords, and Commons. The King has but a co-ordinate power, and may be overruled by the other two. *Lex Rex. Hunton, of a Limited and Mixed Monarchy*[e]. *Baxter's H. C.*[f] *Polit. Catechis.*

The Fifth.

Birth-right and proximity of blood, give no title to rule or government; and it is lawful to preclude the next heir from his right and succession to the crown. *Lex Rex. Hunt's*

delivered at a conference concerning the power of parliaments to proceed against their king for misgovernment:" and the heads in the title page, upon which these speeches are pretended to be made, are in number nine, and the very same, verbatim, with the titles of Doleman's nine chapters in his first part of the "conference touching the succession to the crown:" and the matter and words of the speeches themselves, almost in all things, are the very same, except the transitions, connections, and some few, not material passages, which are left out. From these conferences of Doleman, which by crafty men were published by retail, in several Pamphlets, speeches, declarations, pernicious deductions, &c. and from the nine speeches last mentioned, all the factious in the late times of rebellion, were furnished with arguments, reasons, examples and pretences for their seditious practices. And the suggestions of the act for the trial of King Charles the first, and the materials of the long speech Bradshaw made, to declare the grounds of the sentence, and aggravate the things laid to his charge, by mis-applying both law and history, were borrowed from these books: as likewise was much of the most seditious part of Milton's book, entituled, "the defence for the people of England." Also in the year 1655 at London, was printed an abstract of Parsons' book containing the substance, and often the words of it." True and Exact History of the Succession—written for the information of such as have been seduced by the "brief history of the succession," p. 1, 2. [Christ Church Pamphlets, 4. C. 17.]

[d] "Goodwin, Joh. one of the most violent of the Republican Sectaries in the time of Charles I. was born 1593, died 1665." Watt. Bibl. Brit.

[e] A Treatise of Monarchy in two parts; concerning Monarchy in general, and concerning this particular Monarchy. 1643, 4to.

[f] Holy Commonwealth, or Political Aphorisms, opening the true principles of Government. Lond. 1659, 12mo.

Postscript[g]. *Dolman. History of Succession*[h]. *Julian*[i] *the Apostate. Mene Tekel.*

The Sixth.

It is lawful for subjects without the consent, and against the command of the supreme magistrate, to enter into leagues, covenants, and associations, for defence of themselves and their religion. *Solemn League and Covenant. Late Association*[k].

The Seventh.

Self-preservation is the fundamental law of nature, and

[g] Argument for the Bishops right with the Postscript, and two Discourses about the Succession and Bill of Exclusion. London, 1682, 8vo.

[h] "A brief history of the Succession, collected out of the records and most authentic historians for the satisfaction of the Earl of H." "Much of the materials of this pamphlet, and most of the history contained in it, are taken out of the Jesuit's [Parsons'] book, the speeches and conferences before-mentioned." (see above, p. 145. not. d.) True and Exact Hist. (a learned refutation of it, exposing its dishonesty,) p. 2.

[i] A libel written against James towards the end of the reign of Charles II. by Sam. Johnson.

[k] For the exclusion and banishment of James II. when Duke of York, "The paper was seized in the Earl of Shaftsbury's Closet by Fran. Gwin, Esq. one of the Clerks of H. M. most Hon. Privy Council, and read Nov. 24, 1681, at the Old Baily before H. M. Commissioners of Oyer and Terminer." It exists in a Pamphlet entitled, "The Two Associations one subscribed by 156 Members of the H. of C. 1643. The other seized in the Closet of the Earl of Shaftsbury, London, 1681." [Among the Atterbury Pamphlets in Christ Church, 5. B. 10.] Those who entered it, did "in the presence of God solemnly promise and vow" that they would "never consent that the said James Duke of York, or any other, who is, or *hath been* a Papist, or *any ways adhered to the Papists* in their wicked designs, be admitted to the succession of the Crown of England. But by all lawful means, and by force of arms if need so require, according to my abilities, will oppose him, and endeavour to subdue, expel and destroy him, if he come into England or the dominions thereof and seek by force to set up his pretended title," also "that with our joint and particular forces we will oppose and pursue unto destruction all such as upon any title whatsoever shall oppose the just and righteous ends of this association." Ib. p. 4, 5.

supersedes the obligation of all others, whensoever they stand in competition with it. *Hobb's De Cive. Leviathan.*

The Eighth.

The doctrine of the Gospel concerning patient suffering of injuries, is not inconsistent with violent resisting of the higher power in case of persecution for religion. *Lex Rex. Julian Apostate. Apolog. Relat.*[l]

The Ninth.

There lies no obligation upon Christians to passive obedience, when the prince commands any thing against the laws of our country; and the primitive Christians chose rather to die than resist, because Christianity was not settled by the laws of the empire. *Julian Apostate.*

The Tenth.

Possession and strength give a right to govern[a]; and success in a cause or enterprise, proclaims it to be lawful and just: to pursue it, is to comply with the will of God, because it is to follow the conduct of His Providence. [a] *Hobbe's.* [b] *Owen's Sermon before the Regicides, Jan.* 31, 1648. *Baxter. Jenken's Petition*[m], *Oct.* 1651.

The Eleventh.

In the state of nature, there is no difference between good and evil, right and wrong; the state of nature is a state of war, in which every man hath a right to all things.

The Twelfth.

The foundation of civil authority is this natural right, which is not given, but left to the supreme magistrate upon

[l] "An apologetical Narration, humbly submitted to the Hon. Houses of Parliament, by Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, William Bridge, Jer. Burroughes, Sidrach Simpson." Lond. 1643. Also entitled, "An apologetical Narration of some Ministers, formerly in exile, now members of the assembly of Divines." [Christ Church Pamphlets, B. 129.]

[m] "Certain Conscientious Queries of Mr. William Jenken, being the grounds of his late Petition and Submission to the present power, 1651, whereunto is annexed his Petition, still very much desired."

men's entering into societies; and not only a foreign invader, but a domestic rebel, puts himself again into state of nature, to be proceeded against, not as a subject, but an enemy, and consequently acquires by his rebellion the same right over the life of his prince, as the prince for the most heinous crimes has over the life of his own subjects.

The Thirteenth.

Every man after his entering into a society, retains a right of defending himself against force, and cannot transfer that right to the Commonwealth, when he consents to that union, whereby a Commonwealth is made; and in case a great many men together have already resisted the Commonwealth, for which every one of them expecteth death, they have liberty then to join together or to assist and defend one another. Their bearing of arms subsequent to the first breach of their duty, though it be to maintain what they have done, is no new unjust act, and if it be only to defend their persons, is not unjust at all.

The Fourteenth.

An oath superadds no obligation to pact, and a pact obliges no farther than it is credited, and consequently if a prince gives any indication that he does not believe the promises of fealty and allegiance made by any of his subjects, they are thereby freed from their subjection, and notwithstanding their pacts and oaths, may lawfully rebel against and destroy their sovereign. *Hobbs, de Cive. Leviathan.*

The Fifteenth.

If a people that by oath and duty are obliged to a sovereign shall sinfully dispossess him, and, contrary to their covenants, choose and covenant with another, they may be obliged by their later covenants, notwithstanding their former. *Baxter H. C.*

The Sixteenth.

All oaths are unlawful, and contrary to the word of God. *Quaker.*

The Seventeenth.

An oath obligeth not in the sense of the imposer, but the taker's. *Sheriffs Case.*

The Eighteenth.

Dominion is founded in grace.

The Nineteenth.

The powers of this world are usurpations upon the prerogative of Jesus Christ; and it is the duty of God's people to destroy them, in order to the setting Christ upon His throne. *Fifth-Monarchy-Men.*

The Twentieth.

The presbyterian government is the sceptre of Christ's kingdom, to which kings as well as others are bound to submit; and the king's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, asserted by the Church of England, is injurious to Christ, the sole King and Head of His Church. *Altare Damascenum*[n]. *Apolog. Relat. Hist. Indulg. Cartwright*[o]. *Travers*[o].

The Twenty-first.

It is not lawful for superiors to impose any thing in the worship of God that is not antecedently necessary.

The Twenty-second.

The duty of not offending a weak brother, is inconsistent with all human authority of making laws concerning indifferent things. *Protestant Reconciler*[p].

[n] The author was David Calderwood, a learned Presbyterian writer. It was published under the name (formed from his own by transposition) of Edwardus Didoclavius. It contains a bitter attack on Episcopacy and the English Liturgy. The author had been banished in 1618, published the Alt. Dam. in Holland, A. 1623, and returned to Scotland 1637, (a little before the formation of the Covenant.) Pref. to the A. D.

[o] Hooker's Puritan Opponents.

[p] "Protestant Reconciler, humbly pleading for condescension to dis-

The Twenty-third.

Wicked kings and tyrants ought to be put to death; and if the judges aud inferior magistrates will not do their office, the power of the sword devolves to the people; if the major part of the people refuse to exercise this power, then the ministers may excommunicate such a king; after which it is lawful for any of the subjects to kill him; as the people did Athaliah, and Jehu Jezabel. *Buchanan. Knox. Goodman*[q]. *Gilby*[r]. *Jesuits.*

The Twenty-fourth.

After the sealing of the Scripture canon, the people of God in all ages are to expect new revelations for a rule of their actions[a]; and it is lawful for a private man, having an inward motion from God, to kill a tyrant[b]. [a] *Quakers and other enthusiasts.* [b] *Goodman.*

The Twenty-fifth.

The example of Phineas is to us instead of a command;

senting brethren in things indifferent, and unnecessary for the sake of peace, and shewing how unreasonable it is to make such things the necessary conditions of Communion. By a Well-wisher to the Church's peace and a lamenter of her sad divisions." [Dan. Whitby, D. D.] 1682, 3. In the same year, Dr. Whitby signed a recantation prepared for him by S. Ward, Bishop of Salisbury, wherein he expressed his "true and hearty sorrow for having, through want of prudence and deference to authority, caused it to be printed and published, for any evil influence it hath had upon the dissenters;"—that "whereas it containeth several passages, which I am convinced in my conscience are obnoxious to the Canons, and do reflect upon the governors of the said Church, I do openly revoke and renounce all irreverent and unmeet expressions contained therein." The specific "propositions" here condemned, he "openly renounced, being false, erroneous, and schismatical, and revoked and disclaimed all tenets, positions, and assertions contained in the same book, from whence these positions can be inferred." ap. Sykes "short account of Dr. Whitby." He died 1726, an Arian.

[q] "A noted Puritan, and classed among the Reformers of Religion in Scotland, was born at Chester, 1520, died 1601 or 2." Watt. Bibl. Brit.

[r] Ant. Gilby, a Scotch writer, contemporary with John Knox.

for what God hath commanded or approved in one age, must needs oblige in all. *Goodman. Knox. Naphtali*[s].

The Twenty-sixth.

King Charles the First was lawfully put to death, and his murderers were the blessed instruments of God's glory in their generation. *Milton. Goodwin. Owen.*

The Twenty-seventh.

King Charles the First made war upon his parliament, and in such a case the king may not only be resisted, but he ceaseth to be king. *Baxter.*

We decree, judge, and declare all and every of these propositions to be false, seditious, and impious, and most of them to be also heretical and blasphemous, infamous to Christian religion, and destructive of all government in Church and State.

We farther decree, That the books which contain the aforesaid propositions and impious doctrines, are fitted to deprave good manners, corrupt the minds of unwary men, stir up seditions and tumults, overthrow states and kingdoms, and lead to rebellion, murder of princes, and atheism itself: and therefore we interdict all Members of the University from the reading of the said books, under the penalties in the Statutes expressed. We also order the before-recited books to be publicly burnt by the hand of our Marshal, in the Court of our Schools.

[s] "Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland; with the testimonies of some who have died for the Truth since the year 1660;" ascribed to Sir James Stewart or Stuart, of Goodtrees Bt., Solicitor-General for Scotland, and Mr. Js. Stirling, Minister of Paisley. Sir J. S. wrote in its defence in 1699, "Jus Populi Vindicatum, or the People's right to defend themselves and their covenanted Religion, vindicated: being a Reply to the first part of the Survey of Naphtali." sc. "A Survey of the insolent and infamous Libel, entituled Naphtali; by Andrew Honyman, Bp. of Orkney." Edinb. 1668. 2 parts, 4to. [Watt.]

Likewise we order, That in perpetual memory hereof, these our decrees shall be entered into the registry of our Convocation: and that copies of them being communicated to the several Colleges and Halls within this University, they be there publicly affixed in the Libraries, Refectories, or other fit places, where they may be seen and heard of all.

Lastly, We command and strictly enjoin all and singular the readers, tutors, catechists, and others, to whom the care and trust of institution of youth is committed, that they diligently instruct and ground their scholars in that most necessary doctrine, which in a manner is the badge and character of the Church of England, "Of submitting to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors as unto them that are sent by Him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." Teaching that this submission and obedience is to be clear, absolute, and without exception of any state or order of men. Also that they, according to the Apostle's precept, exhort, "That first of all supplications, prayer, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for the King, and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty, for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour." And in especial manner that they press and oblige them humbly to offer their most ardent and daily prayers to the throne of grace, for the preservation of our Sovereign Lord King Charles, from the attempts of open violence and secret machinations of perfidious traitors; that the Defender of the Faith, being safe under the defence of the Most High, may continue his reign on earth, till he exchange it for that of a late and happy immortality.

For many of the references in this Appendix, the author has to thank the kind pains of the Rev. B. Bandinel, D.D. Bodley's Librarian.

A LETTER

TO THE RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,

RICHARD, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD,

ON THE

TENDENCY TO ROMANISM

IMPUTED TO

DOCTRINES HELD OF OLD, AS NOW, IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH:

WITH A

PREFACE

ON THE

DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

BY THE REV.

E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE;

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

FOURTH EDITION.

OXFORD:

J. H. PARKER:

J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1840.

" To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of the Church of " Rome, were violent and extreme. Some things they do in that they are men, in " that they are wise men and Christian men some things, some things in that " they are men misled and blinded with error. As far as they follow reason and " truth, we fear not to tread the selfsame steps wherein they have gone, and " be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancienter and better, " others whom we much more affect, leaving it for newer and changing it for " worse ; we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than " in defects resemble those whom we love."

HOOKER, Book V. ch. xxviii. sect. 1.

" They which measure religion by dislike of the Church of Rome, think every " man so much the more sound, by how much he can make the corruptions " thereof to seem more large. . . . . Wisdom therefore and skill is requisite to " know, what parts are sound in that Church and what corrupted.

" Neither is it to all men apparent which complain of unsound parts, with " what kind of unsoundness every such part is possessed. They can say, that " in doctrine, in discipline, in prayers, in sacraments, the Church of Rome hath " (as it hath indeed) very foul and gross corruptions ; the nature whereof, not- " withstanding, because they have not for the most part exact skill and know- " ledge to discern, they think that amiss many times which is not ; and the salve " of reformation they mightily call for, but where and what the sores are which " need it, as they wot full little, so they think it not greatly material to search."

HOOKER, Book IV. ch. viii. sect. 2.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

PREFACE.

THE interval of rather more than a year which has elapsed since the first publication of this Letter has, by GOD'S mercy, had much effect in healing the distractions of our Church. Rumours, which were over-hastily believed, have died away; testimony has been borne by persons unconnected with the individuals who were thought to be schismatics, that it is no new doctrine which they teach[1]; the very fact that things remain as they were, has a tendency to reassure men's minds; since it is ever the tendency of novelty and schismatical teaching, to develope itself further, and detach itself more from the doctrines of the Church; stationariness is a proof of adherence to some fixed and definite standard.

They who hold these views have remained, on the whole, where they were, though they have been thoughtlessly branded with schismatical and party-names; though cast off by a portion of their brethren, and taught by the use of this separatist designation to sever themselves, and account themselves a distinct body, they have still no doctrine or practice

[1] See *e. g.* Quarterly Review.

peculiar to themselves; others also keep fast and feast, Ember days and Saints' days, Lent and Easter season; others increase weekly prayers and Communions, and are thankful for God's gift in holy Baptism; regard Confirmation and Ordination as means of grace; prize the privilege of being members of a Church, and in her of the Communion of Saints; acknowledge or demand obedience to her; regard the Creeds as the deposits of the faith, and to be accepted without questioning, on authority, antecedent to proof; look to future judgment: the common, though partially forgotten, truths, and practices, and principles, which they advocated, have been taken up by others independently of them, nay, in some degree by those who oppose them; or what was before more timidly held, has been openly avowed; and now after the lapse of seven years, since the Tracts for the Times made their first feeble appearance, there is less show of any thing distinctive, less by which they can be designated as a party, than there seemed to be at first. Catholic truth cannot be fettered down by party-denominations, but bursts the bands with which the enemy would bind it, by its intrinsic expansiveness. Party-names will adhere to party-views, and attest their human origin. Catholic truth may be miscalled heresy; but neither the infirmities of those who set it forth, nor the misconception of others, will stamp human superscription on that which is Divine.

Then, also, strife is no element for Christian life; and so some, having discharged what they deemed

their duty in combating what they held to be erroneous, have been pleased, we trust, to withdraw from conflict; content to await the issue, "whether" of the twain "God will prosper, whether this or that." Readers have been wearied of controversy, and have been glad to turn back into greener and more wholesome pastures; so that, although there is much in the disunion still existing, to humble ourselves, much in the condition and prospects of our Church to mingle sorrow and humiliation with joy, yet is there ground, in the restored prospect of peace, to acknowledge the good hand of our GOD here, as elsewhere, dealing mercifully with our Church, and aiding her within, while He suffers the storms from without to beat upon her, and attest, by her increased stedfastness amid their assaults, that she is indeed founded upon The Rock.

While, however, many subjects of suspicion have been abated or removed, the misgivings felt have perhaps concentrated themselves, the rather, in some minds upon a single point, and that the more on account of the difficulties which beset it, the doctrine of justification. With some writers, indeed, (such is the inherent tendency to forget, in the struggle, the character of the things contended for) it seems to be chiefly looked upon as the strong-hold in the system whose scripturalness they contend for: they seem to think that the apparent sense of the Articles and Homilies on this point is with them, as they admit the apparent meaning of the Liturgy to be with

those who hold baptismal regeneration. They seem accordingly to adopt it, as the most favourable battle-field in behalf of a system, of whose truth and importance they are persuaded. But others there are, of a less controversial and more practical spirit, who may naturally be unsettled by doctrines and views inconsistent with the theory of justification which has of late been popular; such as baptismal regeneration, an universal judgment, the *necessity* of continual repentance, or that real holiness is to be sought for in this life. Taught to think that a clear view of the doctrine of justification is essential to being justified, they will naturally be the more alarmed at any doubt thrown over what they had been taught; and while some seem to fear for others, these may not unnaturally be anxious for themselves, lest they should be robbed of a doctrine which has been the stay of their conscience, and their hope and peace.

On both accounts, it may not be amiss then to take this opportunity of assisting (if it may be) to remove the misgivings thus raised, in the hope of tending to restore peace to the Church or to individuals. And as the elaborate work, in connection with or in the words of which the statements of this Letter were originally made[1], was written at the suggestion of another, with the very object of removing these perplexities, it seems the more appropriate to connect what suggests itself, with its thoughtfulness.

The misgivings are not, indeed, connected with any

[1] Mr. Newman's Lectures on Justification.

particular language, or theory, or statements of doctrine; they are inherent in the subject itself, and the relation of faith to works in our final acceptance. All, indeed, are agreed on the one side, that the only intrinsically *meritorious* cause of our salvation is the atoning death of our redeeming LORD, embraced by faith; all but the extreme Antinomian, that good works are essential to salvation; all, that every thing we are and have, our justification and sanctification, are the free gifts of GOD, not for our worthiness, but effacing our unworthiness; all, that justification and sanctification are inseparable in act, that none can be justified without being sanctified, nor remain in a state of justification any longer than he continues to be sanctified; all, that the sanctification even of GOD's great saints continues to be imperfect in this life, and that they have, even to the end, need of the prayer which the LORD taught us, "Forgive us our trespasses," as well for their actual and present daily short-comings and infirmities, as for their past offences; —and so, that, superadded to sanctification, purifying us within, there is need of continual remission, cleansing us from without; that, while GOD sanctifies the living members of His Son, and *makes* them more and more righteous, He also, by remitting sin, for CHRIST's sake, accounts them righteous, *in so far* as they are not so;—all, that the best are but "unprofitable servants;" all, that even GOD's best servants have need of His merciful judgment; all, that He will bestow a different crown upon each in proportion to their faithfulness; all, that this crown is His gift, (grace

rewarding, upon grace sanctifying,) not their desert; all, that although sanctification be necessary for our ultimate acceptance, yet to the end we may and must look, over and above, to GOD's mercy in CHRIST; that our hope of salvation rests not upon our sanctification, without an accompanying act of GOD's mercy, forgiving our trespasses.

It would seem, then, that persons who indeed realize the majesty of GOD's holiness, the manifoldness of their own infirmities, the awful sacredness of His law, and the sinfulness of transgression, are agreed in the simple statements of the truth. Persons differ as to the formulæ which they adopt, to combine these truths, more than as to the truths which they receive; often, more than even as to the relative importance in which they practically estimate those truths, or the degree of depth with which they hold them. It may be, indeed, that individuals holding but imperfect views, choose the one or the other formula, as more expressing that side of the truth which they chiefly, or almost exclusively, hold; that, *e. g.* "good works are a *condition* of salvation," may have been a favourite formula with persons who had in a degree rationalized Christianity, and held indistinctly its leading doctrines; or "justification by faith only" may be urged by many, who have inadequate notions of the necessity of sanctification, or its degree, or the zealousness, diligence, self-discipline, watchfulness, necessary to "maintain good works." It is also plain, that the exclusive or paramount use of the one or the other formula will have the

tendency to narrow persons' perception of the truth, and cast their minds into a contracted mould; and we ought to bear in mind not only the abstract soundness of our statement, but its tendency; not only whether it may be justified, but the impression which it would popularly produce.

Still it has been admitted by moderate theologians, even of the reformed school, that the sounder writers in the Church of Rome itself, mean substantially the same as themselves[1], even while they use expressions which more readily bear another meaning; and no one can have read the account of the death-beds of pious Romanists, without perceiving that they put their trust and hope, not in the works which by GOD's grace they had performed, but in His mercy in CHRIST, blotting out their sins, pardoning their imperfections, accepting them in Him.

Truth, then, as well as charity, require us to be very careful how we cast suspicion on others in this point, in which the Church Catholic has not authoritatively pronounced, lest we be found false witnesses against our brethren. Formulæ, also, which are very valuable for opposing particular error, may not be sufficient for inculcating the whole truth; they may express it upon one side only, they may require to be filled up by other teaching. Since GOD, by His Apostle St. James, gave us the way of speaking, "we are justified by works, and not by faith only[2]," to correct the impression which we might derive from

[1] Le Blanc, Theses Theol. de just. inhær.; see also Mr. Newman, Justif. p. 413.

[2] James ii. 24.

that other way of speaking by St. Paul, "we are justified by faith, without the deeds of the law[1]," it were plainly a dangerous idolizing of a formula of our own, so to set up the statement, "we are justified by faith only," as to make it the exclusive test of all sound teaching, and not itself to be restrained from error by the teaching of St. James, as well as to restrain the error to which it was opposed. It is obviously a safeguard against the Romanist, not against the Antinomian or the fanatic; it corrects self-confidence, not indolence. And it may be (as has been suggested) one end for which it pleases God to permit this discrepancy of statements within our Church, that, in the imperfect state in which we now are, we may mutually furnish correctives to the tendency of the other: and that as there are "diversities of gifts," so one shall be a teacher of repentance, diligence, earnestness, self-abasement; another, of lively hope: one, of faith chiefly as issuing in works; another, of works as proceeding from faith: one, of trust in our Lord as pardoning our misdeeds; another, as enabling us by His indwelling Spirit to do deeds acceptable to Him; and so on: that so, each supplying prominently what in another is less apparent, all may, by all together, be built up into "a perfect man;" all "may be convinced of all, be judged of all."

It appears, then, to the writer, that some narrowness of view has occasioned most of the misgivings or objections raised, as though different doctrines,

[1] Rom. iii. 28.

which have of late been more inculcated, were at variance with the doctrine of justification by faith. Thus, for some years, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was held up as at variance with "justification by faith," and faith opposed to the "sacrament of faith," as though justification might not, upon faith, be imparted to us through the Sacrament. And to this the writer chiefly addressed himself in his Letter; this having been the main difficulty which he had met with.

Not less objection has been made of late to the mention of works as connected with justification, though Holy Scripture expressly sanctions the strongest formula which can be used, "we are justified by works and *not* by faith only;" or to "judgment according to works," although Holy Scripture inculcates it so fully and repeatedly, and in such variety of ways; and as if it were not our duty to receive declarations of Holy Scripture, which we might not at any time be able to reconcile, assured that they cannot be contradictory, although they might appear so to many, doubting not that we shall *see* hereafter, if we will be content first to *believe;* and presuming not to square the statements of Holy Scripture by the formulæ which we have, however truly, derived from it, but rather doubting of the accuracy of our own understanding, than of the literal meaning of its plain words.

The difficulties the writer has chiefly met with are of two sorts, both of which require to be treated

with respect or tenderness. 1. A dread, (chiefly for others,) lest the doctrine of the free grace of Almighty God in man's salvation should be obscured. 2. In a more humble and timid sort of Christians, lest a standard should be set up which they shall fall short of; lest, if certain doctrines be true, their own repentance should not be of the right sort, their own righteousness be found wanting in the balance, and they themselves "not stand in the judgment." Yet, while we would speak of these especially, or any others whose fears are real, with deference, it may not, in a charitable faithfulness, be suppressed, that others there are (without judging who they are) to whom this is a strife of words; who do not realize what they are speaking of; who have learnt the doctrine of justification by faith without knowing what "faith" is; who shrink from the close blending of sanctification with justification, because they are really unsanctified; who argue vehemently against judgment by works, because they are conscious that "their" own "deeds are evil;" against self-denying practices, because they are self-indulgent. It is forbidden to judge who these are, separately, one should hope of every one that he were not such; yet no one can observe the dry, abstract, proud way in which these doctrines are often maintained or impugned, as it may be, (especially by anonymous or periodical writers,) without fearing that there is much eager disputing, where there is little appreciation of the truth disputed about, that many are contending

about the title-deeds of our inheritance without caring to enter into it and take possession of it. The same charity which requires that we should not judge individually, demands that this should be said generally, and that without casting a slur upon bodies of men; yet, as suggesting to many to examine the more their own work, and "judge" themselves that they "be not judged of the Lord." Listlessness, indolence, lukewarmness, even sensuality, may be to be dreaded in connexion with elevated and excited feelings, and profession of trust in the merits of the Redeemer, as much as dependence upon self in those who inculcate good works. Both are contradictory, yet both may be, and have been, found together.

Both the classes of difficulties above alluded to, might be removed, the writer is persuaded, by a careful study of the work before referred to: here some hints may be given, which may aid to its better understanding, as well to the preliminary clearing up of those misgivings.

1. With regard to those who dread lest sanctification should be unduly mixed up with justification, their difficulties appear to have arisen chiefly from confounding the *act* of justification with the *state* of justification, (or, as our Catechism expresses it, of "salvation;") GOD's gracious act with our condition, GOD's "justifying" with our "being justified;" and, again, our condition upon our first entrance into that state with our subsequent continuance. For these

would obviously be distinct subjects of inquiry, and would require different answers, wherein justification consisted as GOD's act, (which is the remission of our sins) and wherein our continuing to be justified consists, which is in our being members of His Son, which we do remain through His SPIRIT dwelling in us.

2. It is plain that difficult qualities are in part required in us, for the first acceptance of justification and for continuance in it; *i. e.* more is required of us for the last than for the first. For the first, GOD justifies us, being ungodly, and we have but to accept the pardon which He offers, renouncing the past, accepting the present, looking to the future; it is simple acceptance of a gift from without. Subsequently, we have equally nothing of our own (for all is of GOD), but it must now be no longer something without, but within, us; the power and the will to use GOD's Gift, and the Gift itself, are from GOD, not given to us once for all, but daily and hourly, and at each moment, supplied for the needs of the moment, day, and hour: but still, whether we will use it or no, and the degree of our diligence, is with ourselves; we can refuse, neglect, bury it, or we can stir it up and grow in it. "Hitherto," as St. Chrysostom so often says, "it has been *all* GOD's gift; for the rest, thy own diligence is needed." It is plain, then, since more is required on our part, that we may remain justified, than for our first entrance into that state, "justification," if spoken of as "the *state* of being justified," must include more

than when employed of the first "act of being justified;" in a word, sanctification, though distinct from our original justification, and to be regarded either as its effect, or as, together with it, one of the blessed effects of our union with our LORD, becomes blended with it, so as to be co-existent with it, and separable in idea only. GOD'S mercy in first justifying us when ungodly, is enlarged, not diminished, by His continuing to justify us, being by Him made, and by making us, godly. Christians are on the way from being accounted what they were not, holy, to being what they were accounted. This shall be realized in heaven, when, "GOD" being "all in all," there shall no more remain in any what is alien from, or contrary to, or without, GOD. We shall then, so to say, be wholly justified, because wholly sanctified. We shall be just and saints entirely. But, meanwhile, as GOD'S true servants allow His Spirit to burn out what is impure within them, though they have still need of daily forgiveness, and feel that need the more, there is, actually, less to be forgiven. GOD makes them acceptable to Himself, more by creating in them what is intrinsically acceptable to Him, less by effacing what is displeasing. And thus justification becomes more and more identified with sanctification, although, since the best to the end remain imperfect, there is still need of His grace, justifying them as in part unholy, as well as making them day by day more holy. And so, in the sad reverse, when persons are gradually

falling out of a justified state, their justification, so long as they continue in it, consists more in the remission of sin, through the long-suffering of GOD; less, in sanctification by His SPIRIT.

Either view, then, whether that which separates too broadly sanctification from justification, or that which too much identifies them, would seem to be defective; that which identifies them, seems not to come up to St. Paul's strong statements, that we were justified, being ungodly, nor again to the actual fact, that justification is complete at first, sanctification gradual and increasing; the theory which separates them, falls as much short of the declaration of St. James, as also of St. Paul's or St. John's descriptions of the new life of the Christian in his LORD. In our Articles, on the other hand, while the merits of our LORD are set forth in contrast to our own works or deservings as the sole meritorious cause of our justification, and are declared to be received "by faith," our state of justification is spoken of[1] as identical with the infusion "of the grace of CHRIST, and the inspiration [or in-breathing] of His SPIRIT." In like way also is the truth inculcated practically by the Ancient Church, everywhere asserting the irrespective mercy of GOD in CHRIST, first electing, ingraffing us, remitting sins, re-creating us in CHRIST, justifying us freely; everywhere insisting also on the righteousness of GOD, through the preventing, assisting, perfecting grace of

[1] Art. 13.

CHRIST, realized in us. These two, modern systems have separated; that of Rome, in fact, substituting sanctification for justification; that of ordinary Protestantism detaching sanctification, and assigning to it a subordinate place. These, as has been pointed out, are re-united by the great Divines of our Church, asserting against the Church of Rome, that sanctification has no part in our primary justification, but inculcating that it is by being *made* righteous that we *remain* justified:—

"Such is the contrast," says Mr. Newman, "existing between "the practical and exact senses of the word *justification;* and it "is remarkable that both the one and the other have been "adopted by our standard writers, as has been already instanced "from the Homilies. As controversialists they are Protestants, "as pastoral teachers they are disciples of the Ancient Church. "Who, for instance, is more clear than Bishop Bull in laying "down that justification means *counting* righteous? yet who "more strenuous in maintaining that it consists in *being* righteous? "What he is, such are Hammond, Taylor, Wilson, and a multi-"tude of others; who in this day are called inconsistent, as if "holding two views, whereas those two views are rather proved "to be one, because the same divines hold them."—Lectures on Justification, p. 111. Ed. 1.

These views, it is, again, the tendency of a low self-indulgent age to disunite; and since errors lies near at hand to all truth, so a prevailing error among many of the recent preachers of justification by faith, has been, that they have so strongly insisted on the corruption remaining in the regenerate, and so coldly on the strength bestowed upon them to overcome it, so strongly upon the necessity of imputed, and so

slightly and lifelessly upon imparted righteousness, as much to discourage the very attempt after high and devoted, entire and self-sacrificing obedience.

To re-unite these views has been (as far as another may with humility speak of so thoughtful and comprehensive a work) one of the leading objects in the "Lectures on Justification;" and a careful study of these would, it is conceived, remove the suspicions which, both before and since its appearance, have been cast on the views of justification held in connection with baptismal regeneration. A main object in those Lectures has been, after the pattern of our great divines, to insist on the *reality*, however imperfect, of the righteousness of the Christian; that righteousness is not imputed only, but imparted, first imputed, then imparted; that God, in justifying us, does indeed make us what we were not, but what He therein declares us, righteous; that over and above "the change of the Divine Mind[1]" towards us, there is something "really applied and communicated" to us. There is then, throughout these Lectures, a marked contrast with views now popular; but it relates not to the Divine dealings, but to the condition of man under, in, and through them; not to the source of justification, nor its meritorious cause, nor the means whereby it is received, but to its character when received, *in* the soul of the believer; it is, whether justification issue in real, though imper-

[1] Lect. vi. p. 158. comp. p. 155.

fect, holiness, a holiness which, although imperfect, is acceptable to GOD, or whether, even in a justified state, man "cannot please GOD," but, remaining unholy, is *accounted* only holy for CHRIST's sake. It relates to the state of the soul of the individual, what it is which *in it* GOD looks upon as acceptable.

"In asking, what is our righteousness, I do not mean what "is its *original source*, for this is GOD's mercy; nor what is "its *meritorious cause*, for this is the life, and above all the "death of CHRIST; nor what is the *instrument* of it, for this (I "would maintain) is Holy Baptism; nor what is the *entrance* "into it, for this is regeneration; nor what the *first privilege* "of it, for this is pardon; nor what is the *ultimate fruit*, for "this is everlasting life. I am not inquiring about any thing "past, or any thing future, or any thing on GOD's part, but "of something present and inward. We should not say that "animal life consisted in being born, or in having parents, or "in breathing, or in sensation, or in strength, or in a certain "period of years, or in GOD's will, or in GOD's attributes, or in "GOD's knowledge of us. We should feel that nothing past, or "to come, or external, could be a fit account of that which we "call animal life, and that all answers so framed were beside the "mark. It would be intelligible, for instance, to say that life "consisted in the presence of the soul; but whether we said "this or any thing else, in any case we should fix on something "in us, not out of us. And in like manner, when I ask what is "that, called righteousness, which GOD first clothes us with as with "a robe, then looks upon and accepts, I do not ask why GOD so "looks upon it, but *what* it is He looks upon."—Lect. vi. 146-7.

Before this question was proposed, the doctrine of our Church, that justification, on GOD's part, is "declaring us righteous, when we were not such," had

been maintained fully and at length[1]; it is even declared, that the recent formula is more scientifically correct than the more general practical statements of St. Augustine[2]; the question relates not at all to God's act of justifying, but to our continuance in the state of justification; not to what He doth, when He justifieth us, or man's condition previous to justification, or whether there be any thing acceptable in him, which God in any measure considereth in justifying him; but, assuming as undoubted, that man, being lost and utterly helpless and unable to please God, and sin adhering to all his actions, is taken out of this state by God's free mercy for the merits of Christ alone, the further question is, In what doth this result? What is it, which God, having first given, looks upon as acceptable *in* those whom He has thus justified? To this, two inadequate answers had been given: (1) that of Ultra-Protestants, that it is our faith; (2) that of modern Rome, that it is our inherent righteousness. Mr. Newman suggests a third answer, combining both, and assigning the ground of both, and this in conformity with Holy Scripture and the Ancient Church, that it is our being members of Christ, our being in Christ, and this continued to us by virtue of—

"an inward divine presence, of which both faith and spiritual "renovation are fruits. If such a presence be not vouchsafed,

[1] Lect. iii. Primary Sense of the word Justification.

[2] Ib. p. 68.

" then certainly faith on the one hand, renovation on the other,
" are the ultimate elements to which our state of righteousness
" can be respectively referred in the two theologies. But if it be,
" neither Protestant nor Romanist ought to refuse to admit, and
" in admitting to agree with each other, that the presence of the
" Holy Ghost shed abroad in our hearts, the Author both of
" faith and of renewal, this is really that which makes us right-
" eous, and that our righteousness is the possession of that
" presence."—P. 151.

Again, it is not contended, that man, in this his renewed state, can, even by the grace of God, fulfil His law perfectly; but, acknowledging the imperfection even of God's eminent saints, the question is, whether, as before justification, man, although not wholly evil, was yet, on account of the prevailing evil, displeasing to God, so, after it, though not wholly good, he be not, on account of the prevailing grace, *really* well-pleasing unto God.

Man's state of unrighteousness, before justification, is thus spoken of, adopting the strong words of the Homilies, that we are since Adam's fall " corrupt and naught," and " nothing else but a lump of sin [1]."

" These fearful, yet most true words, do not imply that our
" original nature is pure evil, as the devil is, though even to the
" devil's nature, left to itself, it assuredly tends; they are not
" inconsistent with an admission that the natural man may have
" many high thoughts and wishes, and may love and do what is
" noble, generous, beneficent, courageous, and wise. But the
" writer means that, whatever good principles, in whatever

[1] P. 96, 7.

" degree, remain to us since Adam's fall, they are, to use his own " expression, 'altogether *spotted and defiled*,' thoroughly and " hopelessly steeped in evil, saturated with evil, dissolved in " evil. They do not exist by themselves in their unmixed " nature, as if we could act on them and nothing but them, what- " ever might be their worth if so exerted: but though good, " viewed in themselves, they are, in fact and as found in us, of " a sinful nature. All that we do, whether from better principles " or from worse, whether of an indifferent nature or directly " moral, whether spontaneously, or habitually, or accidentally, all " is pervaded with a quality of evil so odious to Almighty GOD, " as to convert even our best services into profanations; or in the " expressive words of St. Paul, 'They that are in the flesh can- " not *please* GOD.' "—pp. 96, 97.

And, as opposed to this state in which we were "by nature unrighteous, or displeasing to GOD," it is contended that we are, "in a state of grace, *actually* righteous and pleasing to Him."

" Not that there is not abundant evil still remaining in us, but " that justification coming to us in the power and 'inspiration of " the Spirit,' so far dries up the fountain of bitterness and impurity, " that we are forthwith released from GOD's wrath and damnation, " and are enabled in our better deeds to please Him. It places " us above the line in the same sense in which we were before " below it. By nature we were not absolutely devilish, but had " a curse within us which blighted and poisoned our most reli- " gious offerings; by grace we are gifted, not with perfection, " but with a principle hallowing and sweetening all that we are, " all that we do religiously, sustaining, hiding, and (in a sense) " pleading for what remains of sin in us, 'making intercession for " us, according to the will of GOD.' As by nature sin was sove- " reign in us in spite of the remains of heaven, so now grace " triumphs through righteousness in spite of the remains of sin." —P. 99.

In a word, although "good works, which follow after "justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure "the severity of GOD's judgment, yet are" they not, as our Article declares[1], intrinsically "pleasing and "acceptable to GOD in CHRIST?" This is the real contrast between the two schools, (if they must so be called) who claim to follow the teaching of our Church, and who respectively expound her meaning by reference, on the one hand, to continental Reformers, on the other, to the Ancient Church. It is whether GOD's saints are, on the whole, righteous or unrighteous, whether their righteousness be real or reputed only; whether the "infection of nature, "which doth still remain in them that are regene-"rate," or their renewed nature, be predominant; which of the two gives the character and complexion to the whole man; whether, notwithstanding this infection, the whole man be, upon the whole, regarded by GOD as holy, through the Spirit of CHRIST, Which dwelleth in him, and he, being in CHRIST ingraffed, be acceptable to GOD; or whether, notwithstanding this indwelling Spirit, the whole man be, (on account of the remaining infection, against which he daily struggles, and prevails, and for his infirmities in his struggles seeks for pardon,) regarded by GOD as unholy in himself, and only as holy through the imputation of his Saviour's merits to him, externally to himself. This then is the leading

[1] Art. xii.

contrast throughout this work, between a real[1] and an unreal righteousness of God's saints; *i. e.* a righteousness not realized in them, but ascribed to them, though they have it not; between "a real[2] and actual communication to the soul, of the Atonement, through "the ministration of the Spirit," and an external application of its merits; a real and a figurative[3] union with our Lord; between "a nominal change[4], "a nominal righteousness, an external blessing," and "one penetrating inwards into our heart and spirit, "joints and marrow, pervading us with a real efficacy, and wrapping us round in its fulness;" between "a change merely in God's dealings towards us," and "the possession of Himself, of His substantial "grace to touch and reach the root of the evil, the "fountain of our misery, our bitter heart and its inbred "corruption;" it is between justification resulting in righteousness[5], and a "justification without inherent righteousness," such as Luther makes the criterion of a standing or falling Church[6]; justification, as "an act

[1] See Lect. v. throughout, *e. g.* p. 115. 122, 123. 125. 127. 129.

[2] P. 160.

[3] See p. 162. comp. p. 425. "In the foregoing Lectures a view "has been taken substantially the same as this, but approaching "more nearly in language to the Calvinists; viz. that Christ "indwelling is our righteousness; only what is with them a "matter of words I would wish to use in a real sense, as expressing a sacred mystery; and therefore I have spoken of it in the "language of Scripture, as the indwelling of Christ through the "Spirit."

[4] P. 36. [5] P. 159. [6] P. 125.

external to us, continued on into an act within us," and a justification which ever remains external to us, accounting us what we never in this life become; it is between "acceptance [1] on God's part leading to acceptableness on man's, imputation to participation," and an acceptance without an inworked acceptableness, an imputation without a participation of His righteousness.

Again, the righteousness thus claimed as being really inwrought, is not (one is ashamed to be compelled to state it) the *ground* of the Christian's acceptance; the righteousness of the Christian, inwrought by Christ, is not any thing out of Christ, in Whom the Christian lives; the gift is not separate from the Giver; spiritual life is not, any more than natural, independent of Him in Whom we live and move and have our being; rather He Himself is our Life, pouring His life into us here, to return to Him hereafter; and as He Himself, no gift even of His, is the "exceeding just reward" of the faithful, so He Himself, not any gift of His, detached from Him, is our life and our righteousness.

"A Christian's life is not only moral as opposed to vice and "crime, not only religious as opposed to unbelief, not only "renewed as opposed to the old Adam, but spiritual, loving, "pleasing, acceptable, available, just, justifying; not, of course, "the origin or well-spring of our acceptableness, (God forbid!) "but we believe this, — that He who, eighteen hundred years "since, purchased for us sinners the gift of life eternal, with His

[1] P. 92.

" own blood, and at our baptism spoke over each of us the Word " of acceptance, and admitted us at once to His presence, by the " same Word forthwith proceeded to realize His gracious pur- " pose; that 'His word ran very swiftly,' as being 'living and " powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword;' that it " reached even to our hearts, conveying its virtue into our " nature, making us what the Almighty FATHER can delight in, " and so returning to Him not 'void,' but laden with the " triumphs of His grace, the fruits of righteousness in us as 'an " odour of a sweet smell,' as 'spiritual sacrifices acceptable to " GOD, by JESUS CHRIST.' He works out His justification towards " us, in us, with us, through us, and from us, till He receives " back in produce what He gave in seed."—pp. 101, 102.

The Christian's ground of confidence is not his own righteousness, but his LORD; the righteousness worked in him is only an earnest to him that he is yet united with His LORD; it is a token to him of his inward life, as the healthy functions of the body are of the presence of the soul; it is in him, but not of him; and his confidence is not in himself, but in Him of Whom it is.

" The charge [is] not unfounded as regards popular Romanism, " that it views or tends to view the influences of grace, not as the " operations of a Living GOD, but as a something to bargain about, " and buy, and traffic with, as if religion were, not an approach to " things above us, but a commerce with our equals concerning " things we can master. And this is the cause of the suspicions " entertained in many quarters against those who in any sense " teach that obedience justifies, as if it implied we had some- " thing in ourselves to rely upon; whereas if, as I would main- " tain, the Presence of CHRIST is our true righteousness, first " conveyed into us in Baptism, then more sacredly and mys-

" teriously in the Eucharist, we have really no inherent right-
" eousness at all. What seems to be inherent, may be more
" properly called *adherent*, depending, as it does, wholly and
" absolutely upon the Divine Indwelling, not ours to keep, but
" as heat in a sickly person, sustained by means external to him-
" self. If the Presence of CHRIST were to leave us, our renovation
" would go with it, and to say we are justified by renovation,
" only means that we are interested in Him from whom it flows,
" that we dwell beneath the overshadowing power of Him who
" is our Justifier."—Lect. viii. Righteousness viewed as a Gift and a Quality, p. 216—218.

Herein then this view differs both from the Romanist and Ultra-Protestant; from the Ultra-Protestant, in that the righteousness is claimed as real; from the Romanist, in that not it, in itself, but He from whom it flows is, from the beginning to the end, the *direct* source of hope as of strength: engraffing when wild; when engraffed, the sap and nourishment; and accepting the fruit, not as perfected in itself, but as the result of our being in Him, and admitting in us of His richness.

" The inherent righteousness of a true Christian, viewed as
" distinct from CHRIST's inward presence, is something real, and
" doubtless far higher than that of a Jew; but why should we
" so degrade ourselves, so disparage our own high privilege, as to
" view it separately, to disjoin it from Him through whom we do
" it, to linger in the thought of it instead of tracing it back to that
" which is its immediate source; as if a man were to praise the
" daylight, yet forget the sun? No, whatever might be the
" righteousness of the Jews, we certainly know what is ours;
" and it is what they could not have had; it is 'CHRIST,' our
" propitiation, 'within us;' on it we rely, not on ourselves. It
" is our boast thus to retreat from the extreme manifestations of

" life, which is our sanctification, upon that Glory within us,
" which is its fount, and our true justification. It is our blessed-
" ness to have our own glory swallowed up in CHRIST's glory,
" and to consider our works and our holiness, to avail merely as
" securities for the continuance of that glory; not as things to be
" dwelt upon and made much of for their own sake, but as a sort
" of sacramental rite addressed to Him, for the sake of which
" He may be pleased still to illuminate us, as tokens that His
" grace is not in vain. And after all, what we are, whatever it
" is, could not avail, were it tried in the balance, for more than
" this, to prove our earnestness and diligence. Even what is
" acceptable in us, is still so imperfect, that the blood of CHRIST
" is necessary to complete what His Spirit has begun; and as
" His regenerating grace has infused sweetness into what was
" bitter, so must His mercifulness overlook the remaining bitter-
" ness in what He has infused of sweetness."—Ib. p. 230, 1.

It is then, to me, difficult to see wherein the objection of those who judge of this work, not by hearsay or preconceived notions, or upon such acquaintance as may be formed amid anxious duties, but upon careful and competent study, (if any such do object,) really lies. Yet is it better even to take superfluous, and what to some may prove wearisome, pains, if by any means it may remove difficulties out of another's way. I would then draw out some propositions which persons, on whatever grounds, might be anxious to see held, and subjoin some additional passages in which they are substantially contained.

1. Justification is, as a cause, antecedent to sanctification, in which it issues.

" First, Justification is, properly speaking, a *declaration* of

" righteousness; secondly, it *precedes* renewal; thirdly, it is the " *means*, *instrument*, or *cause* of renewal. It is 'the Voice of " the Lord' *calling us*, calling us *what we are not* when it calls " us, calling us *what we then begin to be*."—p. 71.

" Our justification is God's announcement, concurrent with His " own deed so announced; yet in our case, preceding, not follow- " ing His deed, because we are but *made* righteous, and not, as " Christ, righteous from our birth."—p. 83.

" Our justification is not a mere declaration of a past fact, or a " testimony to what is present, or an announcement of what is to " come, but it is the *cause* of that being which before was *not*, and " henceforth *is*."—p. 84.

" Imputed righteousness is the coming in of actual righteous- " ness. They whom God's sovereign voice pronounces just, " forthwith become just. He declares a fact, and makes it a fact " by declaring it. He imputes, not a name, but a substantial " Word, which, being 'ingrafted' in our own hearts, 'is able to " save our souls.' "—p. 86.

" Justification is an announcement or fiat of Almighty God " breaking upon the gloom of our natural state as the Creative " Word upon chaos; that it *declares* the soul righteous, and in " that declaration, on the one hand, conveys *pardon* for its past " sins, and on the other *makes* it actually *righteous*."—p. 90.

" That acceptableness, which He has ever had in the Father's " sight, as being the reflection of the Father's perfections, He first " imputes, then imparts to us."—p. 116. See also p. 127.

2. Justification is a free pardon of us when guilty, from God's mercy alone, irrespective of any thing in man.

" The doctrine of our justification not only implies, but derives " its special force from our being by birth sinners and culprits. " It supposes a judicial process, that is an accuser, a judgment-seat, " and a prisoner. Such is our condition by nature; the devil is our

" accuser. Then, as St. Paul says, '*Every mouth is stopped*, and " all the world is guilty before God.' Under these circumstances, " when there is no health or hope in us, when we hide our faces and " are speechless, the All-merciful God, as we are taught in the " Gospel, for Christ's sake, freely pardons and *justifies* us."—pp. 77, 78.

3. It is wholly from God.

" Justification is wholly the work of God; it comes from God " to us; it is a power exerted on our souls by Him, as the heal- " ing of the Israelites was a power exerted on their bodies. . . . . " Christ's Cross does not justify by being looked at, but by being " applied; not by being gazed at in faith, but by being actually " set up within us, and that not by our act, but by God's invisi- " ble grace. . . . Man cannot make the Saviour of the world his " own; the Cross must be brought home to us, not in word, but " in power, and this is the work of the Spirit. This is justifica- " tion; but when imparted to the soul, it draws blood, it heals, " it purifies, it glorifies."—p. 203.

4. Justification is perfect at once, renewal or sanctification gradual.

" He sanctifies us gradually; but justification is a perfect act, " realizing at once what sanctification does but tend towards. " In it, the whole course of sanctification is anticipated, reckoned, " or imputed to us in its very beginning. Before man has done " any thing as specimen, or paid any thing as instalment, he has " the whole treasures of redemption put to his credit, as if he " were and had done infinitely more than he ever can be or do. " . . . . . Thus justification is at first what renewal could be but " at last; and, therefore, is by no means a mere result or conse- " quence of renewal, but an independent, though not a distinct " act of God's mercy."—p. 79.

5. Justification, meaning thereby the Christian's being made well-pleasing to God at all, does not vary; only, when used to denote the degree of that acceptableness, is it increased or diminished with holiness.

"We here see in what sense it is true that justification admits "of increase, and in what, not. The fact that we are the Temple "of God does not admit of more or less; the words have no "meaning when applied to it. Righteousness then, considered "as the state of being God's temple, cannot be increased; but, "considered as the divine glory which that state implies, it can "be increased, as the pillar of the cloud which guided the Israel-"ites could become more or less bright."—p. 168.

6. Baptized infants are justified, as being made members of Christ.

"This view of the subject enables us to understand how "infants may be regenerate, though they give no indications of "being so. For as God dwelt secretly in His material Temple, "ever hallowing it, yet only in season giving sensible evidences "of what was there, so may He be present with their souls, "rescuing them from Satan, and imparting new powers, mani-"festing new objects, and suggesting new thoughts and desires, "without their being conscious or others witnesses of His work." —p. 169.

7. Justification, although an act at first external to ourselves, requires our subsequent concurrence.

"For these reasons, then, though justification, properly speak-"ing, is a work external to us, it may be viewed as consisting in "evangelical obedience; first, because obedience is specially in-"volved in God's imputation; next, because He does vouchsafe to "realize in part within us what He has provided in its fulness

" out of us ; and, lastly, because our concurrence in being justi-
" fied, is a necessary condition of His justifying."—p. 104.

8. Justification, though productive of renewal, is distinct from it in idea.

" If the justifying Word be attended by the spiritual entrance
" of CHRIST into the soul, justification is perfectly distinct from
" renewal, with which Romanists identify it, yet directly pro-
" ductive of it, which strict Protestants deny. The latter say
" that renewal is a collateral result with justification from faith :
" the former say that it precedes justification. Rather CHRIST's
" sacred presence, which shines forth in the heart straight upon
" the word of justification, creates a renewal there, as certainly as
" a light involves illumination, or fire heat. . . . The one cannot
" be separated from the other except in idea, unless the sun's
" rays can be separated from the sun, or the power of purifying
" from water."—p. 170, 171.

9. Justification does not consist in renewal or sanctification, or any thing of our own.

" Thus an examination of the promises made us in Scripture,
" bears out the conclusion we had already drawn on other
" grounds, that the righteousness, on which we are called right-
" eous, or are justified, that in which justification results or con-
" sists, which conveys or applies the great gospel privileges, that
" this justifying principle, though *within* us, as it must be, if it
" is to separate us from the world, yet is not *of* us or *in* us, not
" any quality or act of our minds, not faith, not renovation, not
" obedience, not any thing cognizable by man, but a certain
" *divine* gift in which all these qualifications are included."—
p. 159. See also p. 173 ; Lect. ii. " Obedience considered as the formal cause of Justification ;" Lect. viii. " Righteousness viewed as a Gift and as a Quality ;" and App. § 4. p. 395—397. and below, on No. 11.

10. Our justification consists in our being members of CHRIST.

" That our justification, or our being accounted righteous by " Almighty GOD, consists in our being grafted into the Body, or " made members of CHRIST, in GOD dwelling in us and our dwell- " ing in GOD, and that the HOLY GHOST is the gracious Agent in " this wonderful work,—all this has been argued from Scripture " in various ways."—p. 233. See also p. 167, quoted Letter, p. 77.

11. Christians please GOD through the character of their obedience, not its perfectness.

" The justifying Word, then, conveys the SPIRIT, and the " SPIRIT makes our works 'pleasing' and 'acceptable' to GOD, " and acceptableness is righteousness; so that the justified are " just, really just, in degree indeed more or less, but really in " this respect,—that their obedience has in it a gracious quality, " which the obedience of unregenerate man has not."—p. 99.

" Christians, fulfil the Law, in the sense of pleasing God; " and 'pleasing' is a very significant word, when well weighed. " Not that we are able to please Him simply and entirely, (for " 'in many things we offend all;' and 'if we say we have no sin, " we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us,') but that the " presence of the SPIRIT is a sanctifying virtue in our hearts, " changing the character of our services, making our obedience " new in kind, not merely fuller in degree, and in this sense a " satisfying obedience, rising up, answering to the *kind* of obe- " dience which is due from us, to the *nature* of the claims which " our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier has upon us."—p. 100.

12. Increase in sanctification does not diminish the necessity of pardon, in order to a man's remaining justified.

" In justifying, God takes away what is past, *by* bringing in " what is new. He takes us out of the fire, by lifting us in His " everlasting hands, and enwrapping us in His own glory.

" Such is justification; but is it not plain that in its beginnings " it will consist of scarcely any thing but pardon? because all " that we have hitherto done is sinful in its nature, and has to be " pardoned, but to be renewed is a work of time; whereas as " time goes on, and we become more holy, it will consist more in " renewal, if not less in pardon, and at least there is no original " sin, as when it was first granted, to be forgiven. It takes us " then at Baptism out of original sin, and leads us all through life " towards the purity of Angels. Naturally, then, when the word " is used to denote the beginning of a justified state, it only, or " chiefly, means acceptance; when the continuance, chiefly sanc- " tification. Writers, then, of congenial sentiments, or the same " writers on different occasions, will speak of it first as consisting " in the remission of sins, with Calvin or Melanchthon, next with " the Romanists, as consisting in renewal."—pp. 112, 113. add p. 128.

And, in contrast with the Roman view, that the inherent righteousness of Christians, after justification, is that which constitutes their justified state.

" Such then is on the part of the extreme Romanists, the reso- " lution of the question *how* inherent righteousness stands the " scrutiny of divine holiness and constitutes our acceptance; they " answer that it consists in an inward divine gift, which has the " power of applying, or springs from the application of Christ's " merits, and so effects or presupposes the cleansing of all sin in " us. Protestants, on the other hand, are accustomed to consider " that the immediate antecedent to justification is an act of par- " don from without upon the soul to be justified, which act, in " consequence, is considered its formal cause. Now there are " many difficulties attending this theory, but its strength in argu- " ment with Romanists lies in the authorities which can be brought

" against them from among their own friends. Some of these " shall be mentioned before we consider the theory itself. A " remarkable testimony, for instance, of this kind is St. Austin's, " who thus speaks in his De Civitate Dei : ' Our very righteous- " ness, although it be real for the faith in Him who is really good " to whom it is referred, yet reaches so far only in this life as " rather to consist in the remission of sins, than in the perfection " of virtues. Witness the prayer of the whole city of God, in its " pilgrimage on the earth ; in that, in all its members, it crieth " to God, Forgive us our trespasses.'—xix. 27. And St. Jerome : " ' For then are we righteous, when we own ourselves sinners ; " our righteousness consisteth not of our own merit, but of the " mercy of God.'—contra Pelag. i. (tom. ii. p. 179.) Against " such statements it seems hardly in point to urge passages from " the Fathers on the other side which speak of inherent righteous- " ness as justifying ; the sole question being whether, *granting* " *this*, it justifies after being sprinkled with the blood of Christ, " which passages such as the above seem clearly to imply. So " again St. Ambrose : ' I will not glory that I am righteous, but " that I am redeemed ; I will glory, not that I am free from sin, " but that sins are remitted me ; not that I have profited, or that " any one hath profited me, but that for me Christ is an Advocate " with the Father, but that for me the Blood of Christ was shed.' " de Jacob et vit. beat. i. 6. And Pope Gregory : ' Our Righteous " Advocate will maintain us righteous in the judgment, because " we both know and accuse ourselves as unrighteous. Trust we " then not in our tears, not in our actions, but in the pleading of " our Advocate.'—In Ezek. lib. i. hom. 7. *fin.* And so St. Ber- " nard on his sick bed, as Hooker after him : ' I confess, I am " not worthy, nor can I by my own merits obtain the kingdom " of heaven ; but my Lord obtaining it by a double right, by " inheritance, namely, from the Father, and the merit of His " Passion, Himself content with the one, bestows on me the " other, by whose gift claiming it, with good ground am I not " confounded.'—Life of S. Bern. i. 12. col. 1084. These pas-

" sages are not inconsistent indeed, still they differ in tone from " the Roman view of the doctrine."—pp. 400, 401.

" In a word, they [many of the Roman doctors] do not consider " our holiness or good works a cause in the *way of nature*, but in " the *mind* and dealings of a gracious God; at the same time, as " is hardly necessary to add, the Roman doctors often use language " most grating and revolting to our ears, and (as we cannot but " think) very perilous to those who acquiesce in it."—p. 403.

" The question is, what is the formal cause of justification:— " now let us grant that our divinely imparted sanctity and works " are not the immediate antecedent to our receiving the sentence " of justification; that justification does not depend on, or con- " sist in any thing we are or can do; that Christ's merits must " ever interpose, intercede between us and God, and so preclude " our righteousness from being the formal cause; the question " recurs, what *is* the formal cause of our justification? and on " this question we shall find in the writings of Protestants great " diversity of opinion and little satisfaction. Some say that faith " is the formal cause, some forgiveness of sins, some the imputa- " tion of Christ's righteousness, and some that there is no formal " cause at all.

" Perhaps the best choice that can be made out of these " answers, is to say it is faith. Such was the answer originally " given by the Lutherans, but they retracted it. And such is the " answer virtually given by Bishop Bull and many others of our " divines who have chosen to express themselves in what may be " called the *calculus* of Protestantism. By faith, according to " Bishop Bull, is meant *fides formata charitate et operibus*, or the " obedience which is of faith; a view which one is glad to find " was admitted in the deliberations of the Council of Trent, and " differs from the view I have called properly Roman, in this, " that by calling inherent righteousness by the name of *faith*, it " implies that that righteousness can only be accepted in Christ, " and is unable to stand God's judgment unless sprinkled with " His Atoning grace."—p. 404.

" To sum up what has been said :—the form into which we cast " the original question was this, are our holiness and works done " in CHRIST accepted or not without a fresh imputation upon them " of CHRIST's merits? do the persons of Christians or do CHRIST's " merits come next upon the act of GOD justifying them? The " Romanist answers, Christians are justified in their holiness and " works without any fresh pardon, and explains himself to mean, " not that CHRIST's merits are not imputed, but that either they " have been imputed once for all on the original justification, or " that their continual imputation accompanies that inward gift of " grace by which Christians are holy and do good works. The " Protestant maintains that we are saved merely by that imputa- " tion, because even granting our holiness and works were in " themselves good, which both Lutherans and Calvinists deny " altogether even of the fruit of the SPIRIT, yet that after all they " would be but inchoate and incomplete.

" Now in the case of those who say that the fruit of the SPIRIT " in us is in no degree good, and that we have no inherent right- " eousness at all, this difference is not verbal; the one party say " that we are justified entirely by what is without us, because " there is nothing within us which can justify; the other by what " GOD plants within us, completed by His merciful imputation. " But those who even though admitting the infection of sin to " remain in the regenerate, deny that it is a mortal matter, or " 'deserves GOD's wrath and damnation;' or even if so, yet that " it may be through GOD's grace subdued, seem to have no irre- " concilable difference on this point with the Romanists. And " this has ever been virtually and practically the prevalent doc- " trine in the English Church; nay, Le Blanc, in his *Theses* " *Theologicæ*, maintains that Protestants generally have no dif- " ference with Romanists on this subject. 'When they [the " Roman doctors] explain their meaning more distinctly, they " come to the same meaning as the Reformed Theologians.'—De " Justit. inhær. 27. But however this may be, at least English " divines teach that our holiness and works done in the SPIRIT

" are something towards salvation, but not enough; or that we " are justified by obedience under the Covenant of mercy, or by " obedience sprinkled with or presented in the Atoning Sacrifice. " According to them then we are saved in CHRIST's righteousness, " yet not without our own; or considering CHRIST's righteous- " ness as a formal cause, by two contemporaneous formal causes, " by a righteousness, meritorious on CHRIST's part, inchoate on " ours."—pp. 412—414.

" Our divines, though of very different Schools, have, with a " few exceptions, agreed in this, that justification is gained by " obedience in the shape of faith, that is, an obedience which con- " fesses it is not sufficient, and trusts solely in CHRIST's merits " for acceptance; which is in other words the doctrine of two " righteousnesses, a perfect and imperfect; not the Roman, that " obedience justifies without a continual imputation of CHRIST's " merits; nor the Protestant, that imputation justifies distinct " from obedience; but a middle way, that obedience justifies *in*, " or *under* CHRIST's Covenant, or sprinkled with CHRIST's meri- " torious sacrifice. It would be easy to show this in the case of " Bull, Taylor, Barrow, Tillotson, and Wake, who implies his " agreement with Bossuet on this point, Expos. Art. 5. Nay, " it is almost the opinion of the Calvinists, which is worth " remarking. Davenant, for instance, grants the doctrine of " justitia inchoata. He grants, it is true righteousness in the " same sense in which a white wall, though not perfectly white, " has whiteness, (vid. Extract, p. 91.) and he grants that inherent " righteousness is justification in a *passive* sense, or what he calls " *justifaction*, c. 22; that is, in fact, we have two righteous- " nesses, a perfect and an imperfect, CHRIST's and our own; the " point in which he differs being merely this, whether this inchoate " righteousness can be said to tend towards justification, or to " serve us in any stead in GOD's sight. And this would seem " very much a question of words; for if he means to deny it is " such as we can *trust* to, Bucer confesses this distinctly; but " that there is something good in it, he surely cannot deny, unless

" he will contend there is no whiteness in a wall that is partially " white. Nay, in one place he confesses as to a kindred point, " 'We have then no dispute with the fathers, nor with these " sounder Romanists, on the mere term *merit*, (although it is " much better and safer to abstain from this word,) but we will " contend against the modern Papists.'—De Just. Act. c. 53.

" To the same effect Hooker, whose view of justification is " supposed to be adverse to Bucer's and Bull's; 'I will not in " this place dispute . . . whether truly it may not be said, that " penitent both weeping and fasting are means to blot out sin, " means whereby, through God's unspeakable and undeserved " mercy, we obtain or procure to ourselves pardon; which attain- " ment unto any gracious benefit by Him bestowed, the phrase " of Antiquity useth to express by the name of merit.' Eccl. " Pol. v. Hooker then holds that God has not only made His " Son Righteousness to us by imputation, but that He does for " us *still more;* He *begins* actually to *make* us in this life what " Christ is, righteous. That doctrine surely is neither deroga- " tory to God's grace nor an incentive to man's pride, which, " while it *adds* a gift, does not tend to dispense with the utter " necessity of Christ's merits for our justification. In like man- " ner Chamier makes this curious confession:—'We . . . deny " not that our righteousness in some sort *consists in inherent right-* " *eousness*, as we have often attested, namely, because we must " needs die to sin and live to God. But still we place the begin- " ning and end of righteousness in the remission of sins; namely, " because this makes us righteous before God, which the perfec- " tion of virtues cannot. What is the difference then? namely, " that we distinguish two righteousnesses, as well as *two formal* " *causes*, *since* it is absurd, that there should be two formal " causes of one and the same thing;—we, therefore, have entitled " our righteousness, as far as it consists in remission of sins, justi- " fication, with Paul, but that which consists in the perfection of " virtues, sanctification.' . . . All this being considered, it does " not seem rash to say with Grotius, that, so that we acknowledge

" that man does not procure remission of sins by any thing " he can do, but yet is retained in God's favour by obedience, " 'cætera quæ disputantur,' *theologically* not *practically*, 'sunt " Scholastica et Metaphysicalia.'—Animadv. in Rivet. 4."—pp. 420—422.

13. The source of our acceptance is our union with Christ, and the Father looks upon us as acceptable, as being in Him.

" What in truth is the gift even in this our state of humili- " ation, but a grafting invisibly into the Body of Christ; a mys- " terious union with Him, and a fellowship in all the grace and " blessedness which is hidden in Him? Thus it separates us " from other children of Adam, is our badge and distinction in " the presence of the unseen world, and is the earnest of greater " good in store. It is an angelic glory which good spirits honour, " which devils tremble at, and which we are bound reverently to " cherish, with a careful abstinence from sin, and with the sacri- " fice of good works. Well then may Prophets and Apostles " exult in it as the great gift of Divine Mercy, as the rich garment " of salvation, and the enjewelled robe of righteousness; as linen " clean and white, or, as it is elsewhere expressed, as 'Christ in " us,' and 'upon us,' and around us; as if it were a light stream- " ing from our hearts, pervading the whole man, enwrapping and " hiding the lineaments and members of our fallen nature, circling " round us, and returning inward to the centre from which it " issues. The Almighty Father, looking on us, sees not us, but " this Sacred Presence, even His dearly beloved Son spiritually " manifested in us; with His blood upon our door-posts, in " earnest of that final abolition of sin which is at length to be " accomplished in us."—pp. 183, 184.

It would then be an unwarrantable misrepresentation, if any should continue to speak of the view of

justification here taken, as any ways trenching upon the free mercy of GOD in CHRIST; in Him it begins, it ends in Him; begins in Him as the source whence it flows, the only meritorious cause of our acceptance; by Him it is sustained, rendering well-pleasing to Him, through His indwelling SPIRIT, those whom He has made members of Himself; in Him it ends, pardoning, for the sake of the precious blood-shedding, "the sins, which," notwithstanding that sanctifying presence, "we by our frailty have committed." There is then no question about the meritorious cause of our acceptance, the Atoning Blood; none, whether we be not at first justified without works; none, about the source of all good works, the indwelling grace of CHRIST, preventing, helping, perfecting; none, whether the works so wrought can, in themselves, sustain the righteous judgment of GOD; none, whether to the end, there be not need of the continual sprinkling of the Blood of CHRIST, making acceptable our offerings, and cleansing our pollutions; none, whether all sin deserve not GOD's wrath, and be not pardoned for the sake of that Blood alone; or, in whatever other way it could be said, that in all things GOD is to us the beginning and the end; the First and the Last; the Author and Finisher of our faith. The question is solely what is the state of those who *have* been justified freely, for members of Satan made members of CHRIST; whether they have a righteousness, not

of their own, not independent, not perfect, not the ground of their acceptance, but still within them, real, in its character well-pleasing to GOD, as resulting from their union with their LORD, and wrought through the SPIRIT of holiness?

But while there is an essential difference of view between those who (chiefly without the Church) hold man's abiding unholiness to be part of the true doctrine of justification by faith, that "since[1] GOD justifies those who are ungodly *when* justified, therefore they are unrighteous ever *after*, nay, not really godly, but only accounted so," there is no intrinsic difference between these views and any (however expressed) which, maintaining that we are justified freely, maintain also that the "elect people of GOD" are in very deed and truth sanctified. The question is not about the terms "justification" and "sanctification," but about the substance. Whoever, with Bishop Andrews[2], holds "a righteousness accounted," *and* "a righteousness done," "the one a quality of the "party, the other an act of the Judge; the one, ours "by influence or infusion; the other, by account or "imputation," holds altogether the same as is here

[1] Lect. 5. Discordant senses given to the word Righteousness, p. 127.

[2] Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6. Bp. Andrews' Devotions so entirely express the wants and desires of a mind trained in the teaching of the ancient Church, that one feels the more confident as to the sameness of his doctrine.

contended for: or again, when Hooker[1] says, "We "have already showed that there be two kinds of "Christian righteousness; the one without us, which "we have by imputation; the other within us, which "consisteth of faith, hope, and charity, and other "Christian virtues.—GOD giveth us both the one "justice and the other; the one by accepting us for "righteous *in* Christ; the other by working Christian "righteousness *in* us;" the doctrine is no other than that so often expressed and vindicated in these lectures, that righteousness is first imputed, then imparted. Again, when Archbishop Bramhall[2] says, "Concern- "ing Justification, we believe that all good Christians "*have true inherent justice, though not perfect,* accord- "ing to a perfection of degrees, as gold is true gold, "though it be mixed with some dross. We believe "that this inherent justice and sanctity doth *make* "*them truly just and holy.* But if the word Justifi- "cation be taken *in sensu forensi*, for the acquittal "of a man from former guilt, to make an offender "just in the eye of the law, as it is opposed to con- "demnation, then it is not our inherent righteousness "that justifieth us in this sense, but the free grace "of GOD for the merits of JESUS CHRIST;"—this contains precisely the two points which Mr. Newman throughout employs himself to establish: against

[1] On Justification, § 21.

[2] Answer to M. de la Militiere.

the Lutheran theory that the true members of CHRIST are *truly*, though imperfectly, just and holy; against the Romanists, that their inherent righteousness does not justify them, in the sense of remission of sins.

I have instanced these passages, because they have been quoted as authorities against the view of justification inculcated by Mr. Newman; and with regard both to these, and still more as to some others, one can only feel surprised how any could have so misconceived those views, as to think that they any way militated against them. The question is not, (it must be repeated,) about the *names* of justification and sanctification, but about the connection of the substance thereby designated; not whether it may not be expedient to use them to designate different sides of the same dispensation, although the one run into the other, but about the "broad separation [1]" of the gifts themselves, as if they were "two altogether *independent* benefits [2];" whereas "Scripture "itself blends them together as intimately as any "system of theology can do." Whatever names be used, or distinctions made, it is one view, which insists on righteousness as being originally imputed from without, then realized and real within, and finally accepted for His merits who imparted it. And this is the teaching of the body of our Divines.

[1] Justification, Lect. ii. p. 44. [2] Ibid. p. 42.

It may be well, however, to say something as to the form into which this subject has been in part cast in Mr. Newman's Lectures, the inquiry into the formal cause of our justification, or "that in which a justified state consists[1]." The words only are scholastic; the inquiry itself very nearly concerns all; it is, what is that in us, wherein, as being justified, we differ from those who are not justified? Mr. Newman answers, as the foundation of all other differences, our being *in* CHRIST, which we are through His indwelling, sanctifying SPIRIT, whereby He dwelleth in us and we in Him. It is superfluous to say, how solemn and awful a character this casts over our Christian existence, realizing what Scripture declares, in its full sense, that we are temples of the HOLY GHOST, or what responsibility is thereby involved towards the heavenly inmate.

Independently, also, of this, it might aid in no slight degree to the restoration of peace in the Church, if, by this view, others, which seem to be opposed, might be united. And this was manifestly the object with Mr. Newman, and indeed incidentally declared so to be.

"It must be carefully kept in view that the object proposed in "these citations from divines of very various sentiments, is that of "showing how they, one and all, converge and approximate to one "main clear and consistent doctrine, if they could forget the "language of their respective schools."—p. 91.

[1] Note on Lect. vi. p. 172.

And, again,

"The point is this: that neither the imputed righteousness of "CHRIST, nor imparted or inherent righteousness, is the consti- "tuting or formal cause of justification, or that in which a justified "state consists; but a gift which includes both of these, and is "greater than either, viz. the actual Presence, in a mysterious "way, or Indwelling in the soul through the SPIRIT, of the WORD "Incarnate, in Whom is the FATHER."—Note on Lect. vi. p. 172.

Nor is the view novel. In our own Church, the Homilies, though not in technical language, express the same doctrine. The Homily on the Resurrection explains St. Paul's words, "rose again for our justification," "rose again to send down His HOLY SPIRIT "to rule in our hearts, to endow us with perfect "righteousness." "Thus," subjoins Mr. Newman [1], "a *justifying righteousness*, viz. that of which St. Paul "speaks as gained by CHRIST'S resurrection, is "ascribed to the work of the HOLY SPIRIT in our "hearts:" and, again, on the words of the homily, "Thou hast received Him, if in true faith and re- "pentance of heart thou hast received Him; if in "purpose of amendment thou hast received Him for "an everlasting gage, or pledge of thy salvation. "Thou hast received His body which was once bro- "ken, and His blood *which was shed for the remission* "*of thy sin.* Thou hast received His body, *to have* "*within thee the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,* "*for to dwell with thee,* to endow thee with grace, to

[1] l. c. See the whole Comment, pp. 172—175.

" strengthen thee against thine enemies, and to com-
" fort thee with Their presence. *Thou hast received*
" *His body to endow thee with everlasting righteousness*,
" to assure thee of everlasting bliss, and life of thy
" soul;" Mr. Newman remarks, " Thus justification
" consists in 'righteousness,' and righteousness in
" the inward presence of GOD, in 'receiving' within
" us CHRIST'S 'body' and 'blood which was shed for
" the remission of sins;' which moreover communi-
" cates, 'to dwell in us,' the FATHER, the SON, and
" the HOLY GHOST."

In the Ancient Church, Petavius asserts this to be the general view of the fathers. To translate the passages quoted by Mr Newman[1]; "Thus then, " when we read that the HOLY SPIRIT is imparted " and communicated to the faithful and righteous, it " might seem that not Himself personally, but His " efficacy is bestowed; and such is the ordinary " meaning of those who are less read in the ancient " fathers. But whoso will attentively examine, will " perceive, that continual mention is there made of " a certain secret and unwonted mode of sending and " communicating, whereby the Divine SPIRIT, intro-" ducing Himself into the souls of the righteous, " is united with them; and that this is not acci-" dental, so to speak, (*i. e.* is not wrought only by " that divine and heavenly quality which the same

[1] App. p. 398. " Out of the many which might be quoted from his De Trinitate, lib. viii."

" Spirit, the Author and Giver of heavenly gifts, " sheds abroad in our hearts,) but essential, *i. e.* sub- " stantial; so that the very substance of the Holy " Spirit is joined with us, and *maketh us* holy and " *righteous*, and lastly, the sons of God." (4. § 5.) "Al- " together, then Didymus thought that the Holy " Spirit justifieth men by a certain hidden *infusion of* " *His* substance. The same you will read also in Pas- " chasius and Bernard, of that participation of the " substance of the Holy Spirit *whereby* we are made " *good* or wise, *i. e.* righteous and holy." (ib. § 15.) "It " is evident from their [the fathers'] decrees, that the " *state of righteousness* and holiness *is* not *wrought in* " *us* by any created thing or quality, but *by the very* " *substance of the Holy Spirit, as that which chiefly* " *constituteth it*" [*principali forma.*] (5. § 1.) "And " this is very agreeable to the sentiments of Cyril and " other fathers . . . . which set forth that the Holy " Spirit is, as it were, a ποιότης of Divinity, *i. e.* a " form, which rendereth those in whom He dwelleth " ποιούς τινας" [of a certain quality.] (Ib. § 15.) " Let all the testimonies of ancient fathers above " explained, be reviewed, and what is of more weight " than they, those passages of Scripture which teach " that either God simply, or especially the Son, is " joined with the *righteous*, or *dwelleth in* them, we " should find that most of them attest, that this " taketh place through the Holy Spirit, as the proxi- " mate, and, so to speak, formal cause."

It is unnecessary, after these full statements, to quote in detail the individuals pointed out by Mr. Newman as holding more or less distinctly the same view; yet it is interesting to find this agreement or approximation in minds of such different moulds and schools as Lombard, St. Thomas, Caietan, Conradus, Soto, Bonaventura [1], Hooker [2], Baxter [3], Luther [4], Chamier [5], Davenant, Calvin, Bucer [6].

It is trusted that the statements thus brought out will allay the fears of "those whom the LORD hath not made sad;" persons of tender and timid consciences, who have been taught that any mention of works involves the being "debtors to keep the whole law;" whose views of holiness are too clear, and of their own unholiness too acute, not to dread being cast on any degree of holiness wrought in them, as the independent ground of their hopes. No such doctrine has been taught. But at the same time, it must again be said, that, considering the way in which the doctrine of justification by faith has been tossed to and fro, and with what roughness and irreverence it has oftentimes, of late, been discussed or maintained, it seems too much to be feared, that many eager disputants have never thought what "faith" or "righteousness" are; that

[1] App. p. 397. [2] Ib. p. 423, 4. [3] P. 153, 4.

[4] Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, p. 28, ed. 1. p. 123, ed. 2.

[5] See above (as translated from Mr. Newman) p. xxxix.

[6] Justification, App. p. 426.

with them the whole is a question of words and theories, which they have taken up as the popular teaching, without ever realizing them; that they seek to be "justified without works," rather than "by faith;" that they shrink from the thought of the indwelling SPIRIT, because they have not in themselves "the fruits of the SPIRIT;" because the thought of that Holy Being as actually indwelling, would require greater strictness and watchfulness over their actions, and a more awful care of, and reverence for, themselves, as being His temples. "Justification by faith" is to them an easy profession; it leaves them free, unconstrained; it makes all right; the indwelling of the SPIRIT is a law within (Rom. viii.), taking place of the law without (Rom. vii.), but It is equally "a law," equally requires obedience; only that It will supply what It requires. The obedience to the law is not repealed; but the power to perform it given. Christians are not *under* a law, but have the law within them; yet so must they be the more actuated by the law, controlled by the law; more than before, only from within, as well as from without in Holy Scripture. This some like not. It does away with the supposed liberty of the Gospel. It leaves them as much in constraint as before; nay, they must needs be more watchful, more timid of doing wrong, more jealous over themselves, more careful of details; as one would tread reverently and lowlily in GOD'S House, and touch with respectful care vessels sanctified by

use in His service, so does the Christian's body and soul acquire an awful character, if the whole man be indeed "an habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph. ii. 22). The "vessel" of our bodies must indeed be "possessed in honour" if it be consecrated with such a Presence; "God" must indeed be "glorified in" our "spirits and our bodies," if they are in such sense "God's." This constraint some misliking, condemn, as mysticism, the doctrine which condemns themselves and their unheedful ways. One would not even in thought imagine who these may be; individually, one would hope of all, one by one, that they were not such; but in an age of so much profession, and so little practice, which speaks so much of faith, and practises, so little, good works, and "vaunts itself" so much, it is much to be feared that there must be many, who at present lie under the sentence of such as say, "Lord, Lord, but do not the things which I say." And this is said not to disparage any opinions or views within or without the Church, but if by any means it may tend to dispel the self-deceit of any; and God may give them repentance, to recover them out of the snare of the devil, whatever that snare be, or however hidden from them.

Other points dwelt upon in the Letter, it is, from different causes, little necessary to do more than name. The doctrine of "reserve in communicating

religious knowledge," in other words, "carefulness in not obtruding religious truth upon minds unfitted to receive it," had given rise to little controversy when the Letter was first written; it relates also to an ἦθος, a moral principle, a natural instinct, Christian wisdom and discretion, rather than to the class of subjects upon which this Letter was employed; and now, all necessity of explaining or defending it, is superseded by the further developement of the subject by the thoughtful writer himself[1]. If they, who seem perhaps most to need it, will not be benefited by it, at least it may be hoped that it will be useful to such, as having come to the knowledge of neglected truths, might be disposed to advocate them in a spirit of excitement, or without reference to times and seasons.

On another subject, the distinction of "deadly sin," which has been remarked upon, was used in no other sense, than in that in which it is employed in our Articles (Art. XVI[2].) and Litany; and while it is, of course, felt that every sin needs to be washed away by repentance, and effaced by the Blood of CHRIST, and the greatest saints have been ever ready to confess themselves, in true humility, the "chief of sinners," and it was observed (Letter, p. 86) that Rome had erred in the "refined distinctions which she made in carrying out her divisions of mortal and venial

[1] Tract No. 87.

[2] Referred to in the Letter itself, p. 83.

sins," yet it would be introducing Stoicism into the Gospel, to contend that all sins were equal; nor would any one who never did repent, repent alike deeply of all his sins, or think that all were alike to be repented of. Conscience, when not bound down by a system, would reject the notion that adultery and some slight excess in eating were equal sins, although, under a system, there have been who have maintained it. Rather, while they who have been saved from greater sins, acknowledge that it is of GOD'S mercy that they have been so preserved, by which same mercy others have been led to repentance of them; let each repent of the sins into which he has fallen, according to their magnitude and their aggravations in himself; listening to conscience, and not to human theories, which will not avail in the day of judgment; that so humbling himself he may be exalted.

Thus much having been said on the topics of the Letter, there are two points as to the Letter itself, upon which I would wish to explain myself.

The first relates to the extent to which I claimed the benefit of the acquittal of the Bishop of Oxford for the writers of the Tracts (Letter, p. 8, 9). I desired, certainly, most scrupulously to adhere to the very letter of his Lordship's words, altering them no further than was necessary for the change of person, in quoting to his Lordship his own words. The Bishop of Oxford had been called upon by publica-

tions little inclined to recognize Episcopal authority, and anonymously, to pass censure upon the Tracts; he did pronounce "The authors of the Tracts in question have laid no such painful necessity [that of "interfering"] upon me, nor have I to fear that they ever will do so." I was myself addressing him as one of those "authors;" and it certainly never occurred to me that in mentioning this acquittal of his Lordship, I should be understood to claim it, further than on the subjects upon which he had been appealed to, upon which he had pronounced, and on which I was writing,—the charges made upon the writers of the Tracts, for what they had therein expressed. One individual has, it seems, given my words another meaning, as though I meant to claim the protection of the Bishop's name for the various other publications of the writers of the Tracts; I therefore would take this opportunity of saying, that I meant to adhere rigidly to his Lordship's words, and had no thought of any thing except those Tracts.

2. I have understood that parts of my Letter have given pain to some good men, as though their views were unfairly represented in it. This would be a subject of much regret in any case; but especially where one chief object was to conciliate and promote peace, I should be the more sorry to give pain to those with whom (in common with such whose views of doctrine and practice I more closely share,) I

wish to be at one; or to misunderstand those by whom we should wish to be understood. I spared no pains certainly to understand the views to which I alluded; and the testimony borne by Mr. Platt's Letter (who is allowed to be well acquainted with them,) seemed to me subsequently to attest the correctness of my own. But, in truth, I had no reference to individuals, (although every one's impression must, in part, be collected from individuals,) but to a scheme of doctrine, itself of foreign origin, the offspring of a distinct reformation, represented most purely in this country by the Dissenters, but elements of which were, in the last century, taken up and mingled with the teaching of the Church. Within the Church, that scheme has ever been modified by her Liturgy and Offices; and, of late, the more, although insensibly, since this meaning of those services has been more brought out by those who have themselves been opposed: some who have opposed the authors of the Tracts for the Times, have themselves entered independently upon the examination of our common Liturgy, and so drawing from a common source, have unknowingly approached nearer; others have unconsciously imbibed portions of views, which they have heard frequently discussed; and thus, in one way or other, that large section of the Church, which has chiefly declared against the views advocated in the Tracts, has itself insensibly been modi-

fied, and is no longer what it was a few years past. There must be also, and is among those who would class themselves in that section, and whose friendships and associations are chiefly or almost exclusively within it, so great a variety of shades of opinion and doctrine, that no one would attempt to speak of it as a whole: some, a few years past, felt themselves drawn more nearly to Dissenters than to such members or ministers of their Church as held high Church views; others seem now but very little separated from High Churchmen (to use the term), except by old association. It seems then a little hard if these last will so identify themselves with those who hold the most purely the Genevan doctrines and views, as to think themselves aggrieved, when,—not those who hold them, but—these views are spoken of with blame.

Not knowing well what the passages are which have been thus interpreted, and learning incidentally that one was so interpreted, (p. 88,) which relates, in the strongest portions, to the Wesleyans, I can only beg of them and other my brethren, to interpret me as one who longs for unity within our Church, that so she may promote unity in the whole Church of Christ, and who therefore meant not and mean not any thing which could tend to aggravate or continue our disunion, and would wish unsaid any thing which, although not meant, might readily so be interpreted. Much less would I be thought to speak harshly of

any bodies of men. Every system has its hangers-on, who belong to it in name only; and so if those who have their name from the Gospel, number among themselves such as know little of the practice of the Gospel, it is but what our LORD foretold should be the condition of the Church; much more then of any section in it. It may be said, then, that there seem to be such [1], I trust, without offence, or seeming to disparage any class of men or of Ministers. They who are pained by reading these things will, of themselves, judge how much more painful to say them. They are said with real affection, humility, and respect, towards all such, as answer, in life and conversation, to the title which that section of the Church bears. The less one esteems the scheme of doctrine which they have unconsciously imbibed from a foreign Reformation, and confounded with our own, the more must one respect the individuals whose piety is sustained amid what, compared with the ancient Church, are meagre pastures.

There are many signs, that GOD is mercifully healing the distractions of our Church. Doctrines and practices, which had recently been cast into the shade, could not be restored without contradiction or misconception both of the things themselves and of those who inculcated them; but year by year seems to be drawing nearer to each other those who on

[1] Above, p. xii. and xlix.

either side are in earnest; their differences lie continually in the mode of stating the truths they hold, rather than in the truths themselves; and there is much real agreement, where there is apparent dissimilarity; and this agreement is being consolidated, issuing, it is to be hoped, not in the false unity attained by the suppression of doctrine or the agreement to disagree, but the unity of the one body through the One Spirit.

A high office appears to be reserved for our Church, when humbled for its disunion, and the dereliction of duty during the past century which immediately occasioned it, and her present neglects, and so restored to "unity in herself," and clad again in her full dowry of doctrine, discipline, devotion, and holy deeds; to this end the good hand of our God seems to be leading her, and making all things tend; to this restoration we would all severally contribute; and if for the time we must labour separately, and suffer reproach from those with whom we would be fellow-labourers, at least we would not aggravate these disorders, but rather wait with patience, until we be acknowledged of those, who now cast out our name as evil, and stigmatize with human names, those who would bear no Name, but That which has been named upon them. Let it not be thought then that we would wilfully alienate any; let not what is capable of two constructions be (as it has been) taken in the harshest; but let those who would themselves

be charitable, show their charity in this, that they would believe us also to wish to be meek, humble, and charitable, and to promote that love, which our Lord left as the mark of His disciples, the first-fruit of His Spirit, the condition of His indwelling, the credentials of His Church to the world, the glory and the means of its perfection; the earnest of our acceptance in the day of judgment[1].

Feast of St. James,
1840.

[1] John xiii. 35; Gal. v. 23; 1 John iv. 12; John xvii. 21—23; 1 John iv. 17.

A

LETTER

TO THE RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,

RICHARD, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD.

A

LETTER,

&c.

My dear Lord,

In ordinary times it is best and simplest to be silent amidst misrepresentations, and to commit our innocence to God, leaving it to Him to bring it out when to Him seems good; "As for me, I was like a deaf "man and heard not, and as one that is dumb, who "doth not open his mouth; I became even as a man "that heareth not, and in whose mouth are no re- "proofs: for in Thee, O Lord, have I put my trust; "Thou shalt answer for me, O Lord my God[1]." Extensive good to the many must always be purchased by the suffering of the few: it is a portion of the Cross which our Lord has bequeathed as a precious gift to His disciples, and they must take it humbly and thankfully; glad if they may indeed think that they have a portion of it, yet scarce venturing to decide for themselves whether it be in truth His Cross, or the chastisement of their own

[1] Ps. xxxviii. 13—15.

infirmities, yet taking it at all events quietly and joyously, that so, sanctified by that meritorious Cross, it may turn to their joy and consolation; and to those, to whom it is indeed His Cross, to their crown.

These, however, are not ordinary times; the waters, which stagnated during the last century, are being stirred vehemently; we trust, for the health of those who shall be cast into them; but amid the first troubling, people seem to be tossed this way and that, not knowing whither themselves shall be borne, and more curious about the fate of others, than anxious to secure their own. It is not among the least strange circumstances of the times, that tracts, written for a temporary purpose, by persons unknown, or those who were known, but little known beyond their own University, should within a few years have been made, against the will of their writers, into a sort of touchstone of opinion almost throughout the land; it is stranger yet, that the greater part of those who make these tracts a test of soundness or unsoundness of faith, should be ready to confess not even to have seen them, but have gleaned what little they know of them from the report of one or two periodicals; stranger yet, that publications devoted to politics, should, at a time of great political expectation, break off their speculations, or books of gossip[1] "cut off their tale, to

[1] "Travels in Town."

talk of" deep and sacred subjects of theology, and descant on the gifts of God in Baptism, or on the succession of Bishops; or a defence of the Establishment[1] be changed into an "accuser of its brethren." Amid this chaos, it is certainly *not* strange, that the wildest misconceptions should be commonly circulated and greedily received; that tales about the writers in the "Tracts for the Times" should take the place of other novelties, and that those who live to "tell or to hear some new thing," should be more interested in their novelty than their truth; or that truths which were handed down to us by our forefathers, and which in the last century, and in the beginning of the present, were held by the majority of the Clergy, should be stigmatized as novelties, because new to such as have taken their opinions from a modern school.

This ferment has already had its use; the names of individuals have been branded, but the doctrines or practices which they recommend have been at least partially received. Many who opposed them, were obliged to advance a certain way, in order to take a position from which they might with advantage attack them: still more frequently, men were thus constrained to consider subjects which they had hitherto left out of sight, but which once brought before them, demanded an audience, and thereon found admittance, through their manifest coincidence

[1] "Essays on the Church," originally, and still for the most part, an useful exposure of the pseudo-voluntary system.

with the teaching or the services of our Church. Thus many observe the Ember weeks, acknowledge in some degree the duty of fasting, keep some of the festivals of the Church, acknowledge the privileges of their Ministry, are thankful for the gifts of God in their Baptism, have truer views of repentance, recognise the benefits of more frequent Communions, not to speak now of a deeper knowledge of its blessedness, who perhaps little suspect from what quarter they derived their present views. Doubtless too some of those who now have "heresy" upon their lips, have been awakened from their apathy as to its dangers, ultimately, by those whom they now accuse of it; and some have derived unconsciously their value for the distinctive character of their Apostolic Church from those, whom they now too readily suppose to be alienated from, or but lukewarm towards, her. Then also these discussions, though often somewhat rudely and painfully carried on, have spread wide the seed; and so it has reached and lodged in many a heart, which God has prepared to receive it, and to which He has thus brought it, and is taking root, and bringing forth fruit of self-denial, self-discipline, increased devotion, and enlarged charity. We can, in another respect, already, hardly realize the state in which we were some few years ago. The plans of reforming our Liturgy, then so rife (each reformer having a scheme of his own, and agreeing with his fellows only in curtailing[1] the

[1] This, as so much besides, is inherited from the Puritans. See

whole), have shrunk away, or sunk to rest; most have discovered that one hour and an half in a week is but very little to offer to Almighty God: the murmurs against the Athanasian Creed and the imprecatory Psalms, are no longer heard: and those who retain their wishes for some alteration, are content to abandon it for the time as hopeless, and to comfort themselves that if the Liturgy were more perfect, "the sort of idolatry now often offered to it[1]" would be increased, and it might be "placed not only on a level with the Bible, which indeed men often do already, but even above it." Thus the Church has gained a respite; and persons, who love her, might the more cheerfully go on with the task of studying her character, and developing it, in their own practice, and inculcating it on their flocks.

And with this we should have been contented, had we ourselves, or our own character, alone been concerned. Each year is changing or modifying the opinions of numbers among those, who once regarded as novelties the truths which we have put forth in the name of our Church; many now support them, who once opposed them; and of those who have been too long trained in a different system to receive any new impressions, many yet see thus much, that there is nothing in these views inconsistent with piety; and so they are content to wait with Gamaliel, to see

Hooker's Defence of the length of the Church Service, Eccl. Pol. V. xxxii. and notes, ed. Keble.

[1] Essays on the Church, p. 270.

whither this thing would grow, " for if this counsel " or this work be of men, it will come to nought; " but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest " haply ye be found to fight against God."

The case, however, is altered since your Lordship, as our diocesan, has, in the discharge of your sacred office[1], pronounced upon the charges circulated against us; acquitting those among us who are parochial ministers, of any " breach of discipline," and bestowing a refreshing and paternal praise, which we gratefully acknowledge at your Lordship's hands, for our " desire to restore the discipline of the Church," our " attempts to secure a stricter attention to the Rubrical directions in the Book of Common Prayer, and to restore the due observance of the fasts and festivals of the Church:" and on other topics, although your Lordship declines entering into questions, which " might hereafter tend to controversial discussions," (since your Lordship's office is to pronounce and arbitrate, not to dispute with those over whom you are placed in the LORD,) your Lordship has kindly stated that " the authors of the Tracts have not laid upon your Lordship the painful necessity of interfering, nor have you any fear that we shall ever do so." And thus, while we thankfully acknowledge the caution which your Lordship gives, especially to those who have learnt of us, (since in times of excitement

[1] Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, 1838, pp. 20, 21. See Preface to 4th Edition.

there must always be reason to fear lest the truth should be evil spoken of, through the exaggerations of those who receive it,) we feel ourselves acquitted, not of human infirmity, but of having put forth any such doctrine, or in such spirit, as would call for the admonitions of those who have authority in the LORD's vineyard.

But this acquittal by your Lordship, calculated in itself to inspire confidence in the members of the Church, and to procure us peace, has proved only contemporaneous, at least, with yet more violent and more extended censure. Even your Lordship's name and office has not been spared, simply for having acquitted us[1]; many seem to be perplexed, as if there must be some evil about the thing, of which there is so much evil spoken; as the chief captain commanded to examine St. Paul "with scourging, that he might know wherefore they cried so against him." Acts xxii. 24.

In reverence then to your Lordship's office, I would endeavour at least to show those who *will* see, that we were not undeserving of your Lordship's kindness; both lest your Lordship's holy office (for personally your Lordship would be unconcerned) should in the eyes of any be compromised; and in hopes of restoring in some measure that spirit of concord, which your Lordship would promote; for which we pray; and which we very sensibly need, now that

[1] Church of England Review, reprinted in The Times newspaper.

Romanist and Ultra-Protestant are united in an unnatural league against our Church. And in so doing, I would beg respectfully to be understood, not to claim the sanction of your Lordship's authority in behalf of all the views which I profess. In some indeed, and in those affecting the most important questions, I feel assured that I coincide with your Lordship, as having learnt them from the same Mother, the Church of England; others, upon which she has not pronounced, I would claim only to fall within the scope of your Lordship's words: "There must always be allowable "points of difference in the opinions of good men; "and it is only when such opinions are carried into "extremes, or are mooted in a spirit which tends to "schism, that the interference of those in authority "in the Church is called for."

The charges brought against us are heavy; disaffection to our own Church, unfaithfulness to her teaching, a desire to bring in new doctrines, and to conform our Church more to the Church of Rome, to bring back either entire or "modified Popery."

The evidence for these charges is somewhat vague: for ultra-Protestantism has in its own nature no standard except each man's private judgment, and so its notions of Popery vary according to each man's individual views; and that becomes to every one Popish, which in solemnity of observance is greater than his own, or a doctrine, or rite of Antiquity which he holds not. Time was, when the use of the surplice, the cross in Baptism, the very use of the LORD'S

Prayer in the same part of the service which it occupied in the ancient ritual, to bow at the name of our LORD, to stand during the reading of the Gospel, to administer confirmation, to "turn his face "at any time from the people [1], or before service "ended, remove from the place where it was begun," and the like, were accounted Popish by those of the "extreme reformation," whose principle it was that "in nothing they may be followed which are of the "Church of Rome [2]." Whither that principle leads, our Church has once had but too unhappy experience. But the principle, although modified, is not abandoned; it is not now Popish to bow at the name of our LORD in the Creed, but it *is* Popish to do so at any other time; the Cross in Baptism is not Popish, but for any, privately, to retrace that mark upon himself, though a practice of the early Church, is Popish [3]; to baptize infants is not Popish, but to hold that all infants derive benefit from Baptism is altogether Popery; to bow to the Altar where such (as in some cathedrals) is the received custom, is not Popish, but to speak of it with respect is so; the title "Altar" is not Popish in the coronation service, because it is part of the ritual of our Church; but (though a scriptural and primitive title) used by any private Clergyman, it is an indication of Popery [4]: to kneel towards the east, is not Popish in a Cathedral, or in the Ordi-

[1] Hooker, Eccl. Pol. V. xxx. beg.

[2] Hooker, E. P. V. xxviii. beg.

[3] Essays on the Church, p. 290. Fraser's Answer to Dr. Hook's Call to Union, p. 8.

[4] Essays, p. 287. Fraser, p. 21.

nation-service by a Bishop, but in a Priest (although no innovation) it is so; again, it was not so accounted in Hooker's time, in the Church, but that has become Popish in the 19th century, which was not in the 17th; it is *not* Popish, if any one, taking one alternative offered him by his Church [1], "all Priests and Deacons "are to say daily the morning and evening Prayer, "*either privately*, or openly, not being let by sickness "or some other urgent cause," shall say them by himself in his own house; but if any one, taking the alternative *enjoined* to the Parochial Minister, unless "reasonably hindered, say the same in the Parish Church or Chapel, where he ministereth," and from any cause none come "to pray with him," then to pray by himself in the Church *is* Popish, and partakes of the nature of "private masses."

Again, it implies a Papistical leaning to dislike the term "Protestant [2]." And yet this title, the rejection of which is to argue a leaning to Romanism, does not belong historically to our Church, but to the Lutherans, and was still used exclusively of them, in the memory of some of the younger among us; it has no where been adopted by our Church in any formulary or document of her's; nay, it was in 1689 altogether repudiated by the representatives of the inferior Clergy at least, the Lower House of Convocation [3], who would not even

[1] Directions "Concerning the Service of the Church," in Preface to Common Prayer-book.

[2] Essays on the Church, p. 284.

[3] Birch's Life of Tillotson. See at length; Tracts, No. 71, p. 33.

allow of the phrase, "The Protestant religion in general, and the Church of England in particular," lest they should thereby seem in any way to identify themselves with the foreign Churches. Thus then, again, that is to be Papistical in the beginning of the 19th century, which was not at the close of the 17th; or the main body of our Clergy had then a Papistical leaning. The adoption of a Lutheran title might surely better prove those who use it, to identify themselves with the Lutherans, than its rejection to imply any lurking feeling for the Church of Rome. The title, as simply negative, is ill-fitted to characterize the faith of any portion of the Christian Church; it speaks only of what we do not hold, not of what we do hold, and is accordingly in some countries, as Italy, adopted by those who intend thereby to deny, not the errors only held by Rome, but the Faith which she has retained: "which imagine the canker "to have eaten so far into the very bones and mar-"row of the Church of Rome, as if it had not so "much as a sound belief, no, not concerning God "Himself, but that the very belief of the Trinity were "a part of Anti-Christian corruption[1]." For the most part, Protestant is there the title assumed by the infidel. And this abuse of the title lies in its very nature: it is always more real to describe ourselves by what we are, than to state merely what we are not, lest in time our faith should shrink into the mere denial of error, instead of being a confession of the truth.

[1] Hooker, E. P. IV. viii. 2. ed. Keble.

It is Popery again, and disaffection to our Church, to doubt whether the Pope is *the* Anti-christ, even while asserting that there is much anti-Christian[1] in the system of Rome; that as in St. John's time there were "many Anti-christs," and the mystery of iniquity had begun already to work in St. Paul's, and his descriptions were in great degree realized by the Gnostic heresies, so there is also anti-Christianism *in* the system of Rome, though Anti-christ himself be not yet revealed, nor may we yet know when or among whom he will appear.

Again, to approve of any thing in the Roman Breviary, which was not extracted thence by the reformers of our Liturgy, betrays a longing, they say, towards Rome, an argument somewhat singular in their mouths, who speak against the "idolatry of the Prayer-book,"—as if our compilers had been not only wisely governed, but infallibly directed, and so could not have overlooked any thing, which, though not essential, had yet been an additional beauty or perfection, had it been retained. Why, when we have an Easter hymn, should it be Papistical to think Advent hymns, with which the Breviary abounds, had been an accession to our service, realizing as they do the coming and immediate presence of our LORD? or to term the Breviary and Missal, from which most of our own Prayer-book is taken, "precious relics of antiquity?"

My Lord, I would not be misunderstood; we do

[1] See Appendix, Nos. 38. 40, 41. 48. 72. and close of "Earnest Remonstrance," prefixed to Tracts, vol. iii.

not wish, we have never expressed a wish, to have any alteration in the Liturgy of our Church; as we mistrust others in their way, so we mistrust ourselves in our own; they think that our Church erred in retaining too much, we think that she might have retained more of what was ancient in the Breviary and the Missal, without approximating in any way to the corruptions of modern Rome: but there is this difference in our principles, that they, not accustomed to any high views of Church discipline, for the most part as soon as they have an end in view, which they think good, think also that it is good to realize it any how; form societies, enter into combinations, prepare schemes for accomplishing it, take the initiative in it, hoping that those "set over us in the LORD," the Bishops of our Church, will in time fall into it. They are, what they have upbraided one of our friends for terming himself, "Ecclesiastical agitators[1];" only our friend meant by the name "to rouse the Church from within to a sense of her own privileges and gifts," they act upon it, as referring to *outward* changes, whether in her Liturgy or discipline, produced by the "agitation" of a portion of her members. We have been taught to know our own place in the LORD'S vineyard; that we are "under authority;" that our office is not to reform our Church, to add or to take away from her, but to obey her; to study her character, to see how we may more and more bring out and realize her teaching and her principles. We have, further than this, said

[1] Froude's Remains, t. i. p. 258.

again and again (and I refer to this, because they who blame us should at least know our principles), that whatever is done for the Church must not be done by a majority in her, that (to use the words of one of us), "Whatever is done for the Church as a whole, must be done by the Church as a whole[1]." More than this, the writer among us, who from his peculiar mode of expressing himself, could least be judged of by partial extracts, and so has been, perhaps, the most extensively misunderstood, sums up in this reverential way his arguments for not further shortening the Church services. It is manifest that his own heart (one may speak of him, because he is at rest) was with those ages, when "they complied with "Scripture to the letter, praised God seven times a "day, besides their morning and evening prayer." Yet he thus sums up his account of the gradual contraction of them[2]. "This, it will be said, is an argu-

[1] Pref. to St. Augustine's Confessions, p. ix. add. App. No. 54.

[2] Froude's Remains, t. ii. p. 382. Of the same kind is the passage in which, while referring to the changes in our Communion Service, through the foreign reformers, as "a judgment on the Church," he thankfully acquiesces in our present service as "crumbs from the Apostles' table." Better (if one might so expand his metaphor) in itself, to have the whole than the fragments; but better again to have the fragments than the whole, when mingled with foreign ingredients, so that there is "death in the pot," if not to individuals, yet to the Church generally; nay, better again, perhaps, for us, because more suited to us (such as we now are) to be contented with "the crumbs," having again become babes who have "need of milk not of strong meat:" and

" ment not so much for retaining the present form " of the Prayer-book" [for which he had been contending] " as for resorting to what is older. To my " own mind, it is an argument for something different " from either, *for diffidence.* I very much doubt, " whether in these days the spirit of true devotion is " at all understood, and *whether an attempt to go for-* " *ward or backward, may not lead our innovations to* " *the same result.* If the blind lead the blind, shall " they not both fall into the ditch?" I at least, my Lord, must own that I felt impressed and reproved by this deep and self-restraining feeling of a young and ardent mind, mingling self-abasement with aspirations after something higher, and acknowledging himself unworthy to " unloose " even " the shoe-latchet" of that form of worship which in our own devotions we so imperfectly realize.

The feeling of our friend in this passage, and our own, is briefly this, we must have acted up more to the theory of our Church as she is, before we attempt to alter any ritual belonging to her. We must amend ourselves before we amend any thing of her's. When the body of our Clergy shall have acted up to her injunctions, by performing for years, day by day, her daily service, then may they be judges whether any improvements may be introduced into that service; when our service shall have become daily

so also it is implied, they are " crumbs" which we are not worthy to gather up. The expression is abasement of self, not derogation of our service, which is but too good for most of us.

instead of weekly, then may we judge whether any additions should be made to that of the LORD's day; when people, by the daily devotional use of the Psalms, shall have come to learn some portion of their depth, then they will see whether they are not in truth Christian hymns, and how much more of Christian truth they contain than the popular modern hymns, now often in use among us; when we have learnt and taught our congregations the blessedness of infant Baptism, and to be gladdened instead of wearied by seeing our little ones, one by one, made members of CHRIST, or have realized the blessings of our own engraffing into CHRIST, then may they perhaps judge of the language of the Baptismal service; when we have become alive to the importance of a true confession of the Holy Trinity, how much belongs to it, how manifold and subtle the temptations to deviate from it, have jealously observed our own inherent tendencies, and to what heresies our own frame of mind was inclined, or from which we have, perhaps, on the very road, been snatched, then may men judge fitly whether "our Church[1]" at this day "needeth" not, in the Athanasian Creed, "those ancient preservatives, which ages before us were so glad to use;" or rather, when our whole selves shall have been disciplined by her solemn rounds of prayers, thanksgivings, fastings, festivals, Communions, shall we be formed in her model and

[1] Hooker, Eccl. Pol. V. xlii. 13. ed. Keble.

so shall understand her, and may supply any thing lacking to her. Till then, our only safe course is to abide as we are, fitting ourselves to receive any enlargement of our treasures, by learning gratefully to appreciate and to use those which we have. What is good in itself might not be good to us, until we are other than we are.

It is then, my Lord, by judging of us according to their own habits of mind, and inferring that we should feel, act, and think as they would, were they in our stead, that they have come to these strange notions about us. They, with the impatience of modern habits, could not see a fancied defect, without at once casting about how *they* might remove it; they cannot understand that men should think it their duty to sit still, should not have a wish to remove it, if they could; should think that it had been better otherwise, that hereafter what they think best in the abstract, may be best for our Church; may even speak of these things in the hopes of preparing for their ultimate restoration, if it may be, in the days of our sons' sons; but meanwhile would not, if they might, restore them. I mean not in so saying to claim any superiority for ourselves over others; we are, each as we have been trained to be; the difference is in the systems, wherein we have been formed; I would only account for the mistakes which must arise, if those who act upon one set of principles are judged upon by the other. Thus, we would freely express,

as have many of the Bishops of our Church [1], our conviction that the revisers of our Liturgy did unadvisedly in yielding some more explicit statements of doctrine to the suggestions of foreign reformers, whose tone of mind was different from that of our Church; yet could we adopt the words of one, with whose views probably we do not coincide; "Happy is "it for the Church, that there has always been be- "tween these opposite parties" [who would reform the Prayer-book in opposite ways] "a much larger body "of worshippers, who have used their book of Common "Prayer with undisturbed devotion, offering thanks "to GOD continually for His unspeakable gift [2]."

These sentiments we have often expressed [3]: and I may extract here a statement made in a periodical [4], expressing for the most part our sentiments, and which was quoted with pleasure at the time, as a declaration of our practical views, by one [5], whose valued life was devoted to the maintenance of our Church as she is, and the uniform opposer of whatever threatened her with organic change.

"If Anglo-Catholics did but understand their posi-

[1] Such as Bp. Overall, Abp. Sancroft, and Sharp, Bp. Hickes and Horsley. Tract No. 81. ed. 2.

[2] Pref. to two books of Edward VI. compared. Oxford, 1838. p. xxxv.

[3] See Appendix, Nos. 24, 54.

[4] British Critic, vol. xxiv. p. 69.

[5] Rev. H. J. Rose, British Magazine, vol. xiv. p. 219, 20.

" tion, it would be no despicable one. For ourselves,
" we find enough of satisfaction in it, not to be eager
" for any of those changes in the relation of Church
" to State, which late political events and constitu-
" tional reforms make abstractedly fitting. What
" may be the duty of persons in high stations in the
" Church, is another matter, or what might be the
" Church's duty if her members one and all were of
" one mind and one judgment in all things, or what
" may be the duty of individuals as a matter of con-
" science in the event of certain contingencies; but
" at this moment, we conceive that Catholic truth
" will spread and flourish more satisfactorily under the
" existing state of things than on any alteration which
" could be devised. We feel no desire for the meet-
" ing of convocation; we are not even earnest in
" behalf of a repeal of the Statute of Præmunire,
" though it would certainly be becoming and just.
" We want changes of no kind, whether in the
" Prayer Book, or Articles, or Homilies, or Govern-
" ment, except anything can be shown to us in our
" present state to be literally and directly sinful. We
" are content to take things as we have received
" them, and are quite sure that that system which
" was sufficient for the expansive minds of Andrews or
" Laud, has not been so circumscribed by subsequent
" political events, but it will hold us pigmies, how-
" ever large we grow. We may like some parts of
" it less than others; we may conceive that some
" parts might be more primitive, other parts more

" finished; but we are thankful to have, and content
" to use, what has come down to us; and even where
" any thing has had an unsatisfactory origin, we will
" make the best of it, and receive it into, and assimi-
" late it to, the glorious deposit which we inherit
" from the Apostles."

But setting aside these vague suspicions, I would now proceed to lay before your Lordship, in connection with the Articles of our Church, what we (following, as we are assured, those who have been ever accounted the great lights of our Church) believe to be her doctrine, on the points whereon we are accused; and that (wherever the case admits) in contrast with Romanism on the one hand, and Ultra-Protestantism on the other. Thus it will appear, I trust, that the "*via media*," along which we, with our Church, would fain tread, though distinct from the bye ways of Ultra-Protestantism, is a broad and tangible line, not verging towards, or losing itself in Romanism. Rather is it the "old path" of the Primitive Church, after whose model our own was reformed, and which, amid the entanglements of the modern deviations of Rome, our reformers wished, I believe, to trace out.

On the first five articles of our Church, those which relate to the Holy Trinity, happily no imputation has been cast against us; and on these, even the Church of Rome is allowed to have transmitted faithfully the doctrine of the primitive Church. Would, my Lord, that there were no signs of unsoundness on any other side! But whereas a traditionary faith would be

safe with regard to these essential articles, in that it would depart neither to the right nor to the left from that which the Universal Church had attested to be the Apostolic and Scriptural creed, the greater, because unsuspected, danger will beset those who profess to draw their faith, unaided, from Holy Scripture. If it overtake them not, it is because their faith is better than the principles which they profess; they are sound and orthodox, not in consequence of their principles, but in despite of their natural tendency. The natural bias of what terms itself a "Scriptural Theology" is to a naked Creed; it would cast aside all but Scriptural terms; confine itself to Scriptural phrases; reject as "scholastic distinctions" the fuller declarations, which have been committed to the Church; boasts of contenting itself with what it terms practical truths, or what it decides to be such; takes further statements, first as simply negative, then supersedes them as having been useful formerly, but not needed now[1], dwells not upon them, drops them

[1] "The like may be said of the *Gloria Patri* and the Athana-
"sian Creed. It was first brought into the Church to the end
"that men thereby should make an open profession in the Church
"of the Divinity of the Son of God against the detestable opinion
"of Arius and his disciples, wherewith at that time marvellously
"swarmed almost the whole of Christendom. Now that it has
"pleased the Lord to quench that fire, there is no such cause
"why these things should be in the Church, at the least why
"that *Gloria Patri* should be so often repeated."—Cartwright ap. Hooker, E. P. V. xlii. 1. ed. Keble, and Hooker's answer, especially § 11 sqq.

from its Creed, takes an attitude of hostility against them, generalizes its faith; and then, since the mind must think one way or other, whenever subjects are brought before it in detail, falls an easy prey to the heresies, from which the Church would have rescued them. All true Theology must of necessity be Scriptural; but that which terms itself a "Scriptural Theology," has always been a stepping-stone to Socinianism or Rationalism. It begins in an ungrateful spirit, setting at nought the teaching of the Church, and "leaning upon its own understanding;" and it ends in being left to its own understanding, and being "given over to an undistinguishing mind." Such has been the case with every Protestant body, except those *connected with* our own Church, though not *of* it; such is the course which America, as far as it is not Anglican or Romanist, is now taking; and no one can observe the way in which unsound[1] American publications are creeping into this country, by whom introduced, with what apologies, in one instance, for Socinianism; without being convinced that the Ultra-Protestant sects in this country, so far as they do not return to the Church or relapse into Romanism, will take the same course. Those in our Church, who have fraternized with them, are upheld by a traditionary instruction, of which they are unaware, in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds; and while they de-

[1] See Tracts for the Times, Vol. iii. No. 73. "On the introduction of rationalistic principles into religion."

claim against tradition, are probably upheld by tradition against heresies which destroy the soul. And so, we trust, they will continue; but though there is all hope that they will be protected against the grosser forms of heresy, the subtler form of Sabellianism creeps over the mind almost unperceived; and the objections against the title θεοτόκος, with which we have been assailed, imply that some have sadly forgotten what was the origin of the Nestorian heresy [1].

This instance may illustrate the danger of an over-anxiety to recede from Rome, or of sacrificing truths which that corrupt Church has abused; it would lead to too long and involved a discussion to point out, article by article, wherein we, with our Church, differ from that of Rome; I will therefore trespass no longer upon your Lordship's time than the occasion requires, and will confine myself to those articles upon which we have been rumoured to approach nearer to Rome, than the limits of our Church allow. In so doing, I must make many statements, which to your Lordship are trite and familiar; but my object is to lay before your Lordship an explicit con-

[1] "The Christian Knowledge Society has latterly erased from "one of its publications the phrase, 'The mother of God,' rightly "judging it to be Popish. The British Critic demands its re-"instatement, observing, 'As to styling the Blessed Virgin *the* "*mother of God*, did the Essex ministers ever chance to hear of "the council of Ephesus?'"—Essays on the Church, p. 288; also p. 304. Yet the State, by advice of our Church, acknowledged that what the Council of Ephesus "ordered, judged, or determined to be heresy," is such, 1 Eliz. 1. 36.

fession, not to say anything new upon subjects so often handled.

Art. VI. and XX.—*On the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation;* and *Of the authority of the Church.*

These two articles must necessarily be taken together, in order to understand fully the meaning of our Church, on the relation of the authority of the Church to that of Holy Scripture. In the first she declares that "Holy Scripture *contains* all things *ne-*" *cessary to salvation*, so that whatsoever is not read "therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be "*required* of any man to be believed as an article of "the Faith; or be thought requisite or *necessary to* "*salvation*." The article is manifestly directed against the Church of Rome, which has made new articles of *faith*, and so does "*require* to be believed as *necessary to salvation*," things which are not contained in Holy Scripture. But the article, though it states, that Holy Scripture "*contains* all things necessary to salvation," does not say that it *teaches* them in such wise, that every one may collect them thence for himself: nor does it even say, that things may not be believed or practised, which are not contained in Holy Scripture (so that of course, they be not contrary to it); but only that they must not be "*required* to be believed *as necessary to salvation*." It is remarkable that this limitation, which is so singularly

overlooked [1] by those who employ this article against the right use of tradition, occurs, wherever the sufficiency of Holy Scripture is mentioned; so that the compilers of this article must have just meant to exclude the case to which people now so carelessly apply it, of "things, *not* necessary to salvation." Thus, again, in the engagement required at Ordination and Consecration, this limitation is inserted in each clause; "Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain "sufficiently all Doctrine *required of necessity for* "*eternal salvation* through faith in Christ Jesus? and "are you determined out of the said Scriptures to in-"struct the people committed to your charge, and to "teach *nothing* as *required of necessity to eternal salva-*"*tion*, but that which you shall be persuaded, may be "concluded and proved by Holy Scripture [2]?" The very word also, "required," shows that the Church had in view some one in authority who had the power to "require." In the preceding articles our Church had embodied the doctrines of the Creeds, which, and which only, are Articles of Faith, or "necessary to be believed in order to salvation." Those

[1] Thus, one argues that the Apostolical succession is against our Articles, because it cannot be proved by Scripture, and by that Article nothing is to be held [omitting "as necessary to salvation"] which cannot be so proved. There seems to be the same sort of confusion in "Dr. Hook's Call to Union, answered," p. 9. though the instances given are mostly Popish corruptions, and so against "tradition" also.

[2] See further Mr. Keble's Postscript to 3rd ed. of the Sermon, entitled "Primitive tradition recognized in Holy Scripture," p. 12. sqq.

which follow, are Articles of Religion, which she did not receive from the ancient Church, but which she framed herself, not as essential to Communion (for this she requires only the belief in the Articles of the Apostles' Creed) but "for the avoiding of diver-"sities of opinions, and for the establishing of con-"sent touching true religion." Accordingly, at the very outset of this new range of Articles, she draws limits to her own powers and to those of the Church Universal. She does not, like the Church of Rome, increase the Creed, which no particular Church has the right to do; and she lays down within what limits the Creed may be enlarged by the Church Universal; namely, only as to whatsoever is "read in Holy Scripture, or may be proved thereby." She lays down that Holy Scripture is the sole *source* of "all things necessary to salvation;" and that nothing must be "required to be believed as necessary to salvation," but what is drawn from that source; but both at the beginning and the end she restrains what she says, to "things necessary to salvation." So then it is *probable* that our Church means that things may be *required* to be believed, (provided it be not upon peril of salvation,) which are not proved by Holy Scripture: but *certain*, that according to her, things not in Holy Scripture may be subjects of belief; and that there is a power, somewhere residing, which may "*require*" to be "believed as necessary to salvation," whatever *can* be proved by Holy Scripture. For the limitation were absurd, that things not proveable by Holy Scripture, must *not* be required to be

believed "*as necessary to salvation*," unless those which can be so proved, might be required. This very article then, in laying down the "sufficiency of Holy Scripture as the *source* of all saving truth," at the same time recognizes the existence of an authority which may "require to be believed as essential to salvation," what it "can prove thereby." And this authority, in the 20th Article she declares, as in the 6th she implies it, to be the Church; for in the 20th Article there recurs the same language, that, "as it must not "decree any thing contrary to Holy Writ, so besides "the same, ought it not to *enforce* any thing to be "believed *for necessity of salvation*." Within this same limit, however, drawn equally by the 6th, and 20th Articles, the 20th Article expressly states, what the 6th implies; "The Church has authority in controversies of Faith." The Church is subject to Holy Scripture, but set over individuals; she may not (1) "expound one place of Holy Scripture that it be repugnant to another," nor may she (2) "decree any thing *against* Holy Writ," nor may she (3) "*besides* the same, enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation;" but then the very fixing of these limits of her power, shows that she has power within these limits; that she is the "expositor of Holy Writ," provided she do "not expound one place that it be repugnant to another;" she may "decree things," provided they be not "against Holy Writ;" she may "enforce things to be believed" even "*for necessity of salvation*," provided they be

neither "against, nor besides, Holy Scripture." But the power of "expounding," "decreeing," "ordaining," implies that her children are to receive her expositions, and obey her decrees, and accept her authority in controversies of faith: and the appeal lies not to their "private judgment;" they are not the arbiters, whether she pronounce rightly or no; for what sort of decree or authority were that, of which every one were first to judge, and then if his judgment coincided with the law, to obey? who would not see the absurdity of this in matters of human judgment? "If thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge." Jas. iv. 11. "If I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear?" Mal. i. 6.

But our Church in this article further and accurately defines the n ture of her authority; the Church is a "keeper and witness of Holy Writ;" she is its guardian; it is from her that we know of what books the Canon of Scripture consists: she is the "witness" to the truths which it contains; not a "judge" over it, not having to determine new truth, or erect new articles of faith; but a witness to the doctrine which she herself received in continued succession from the primitive Church, as being contained in Holy Scripture.

In brief, then, my Lord, the meaning of our Church (as we conceive) in these Articles is, that the Scripture is the sole authoritative source of the Faith, *i. e.* of "things to be believed in order to salvation;"

the Church is the medium through which that knowledge is conveyed to individuals; she, under her responsibility to God, and in subjection to His Scripture, and with the guidance of His Spirit, testifies to her children, what truths are necessary to be believed in order to salvation; expounds Scripture to them; determines, when controversies arise; and this, not in the character of a judge, but as a "witness" to what she herself received.

And in this view of the meaning of our Church, we are further confirmed by the Canon of the Convocation of 1571, to which we have of late often had occasion to appeal; the same Convocation which inforced subscription to the Articles.

"They [preachers] shall in the first place be careful never to teach any thing from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and *collected out of that very Doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.*"

So have we ever wished to teach, "what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old or New Testament," and as the test of its being thus agreeable, we would take, not our own private and individual judgments, but that of the Universal Church, as attested by the "Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops."

This, my Lord, were perhaps sufficient; nor need we, we conceive, go into the private opinions of those engaged in our Reformation; seeing that they, in many

points, varied from each other, and some of them on some points from themselves: and we have the injunction to take the Articles in their plain grammatical sense. Nor indeed have we our Articles from them; but Articles, in which their opinions have been in some respects modified; we have not the 42 Articles of Edward VI., but the 39 of Q. Elizabeth; and these have their authority to us from the agreement of our Church in 1562 and 1571. We are then in no respects even guided to look to the private opinions of any instruments of the Reformation, as interpreters of the Articles; since we are expressly referred, not to them, but to the "literal and grammatical sense[1]" of the Articles themselves. But we could go further; and show that they who are of most note among them wished to submit their own judgments to that of Antiquity, and at all events, *desired* to hold no other doctrine, than that which had been received by the Primitive Church. They did not appeal to her, as has been recently said, as an *argumentum ad hominem*, merely to refute an adversary with his own weapons[2]. Their very language shows that they were in earnest, and speak with reverence. Abp. Cranmer, for instance, appeals, at a solemn moment, to them, and confesses[3] "in *all* my doctrine and preaching, both of

[1] K. James's declaration prefixed to the Articles.

[2] *e. g.* "Dr. Hook's Call to Union, answered," p. 11.

[3] Works, vol. iv. pp. 126, 7. See further and other authorities in Mr. Manning's Appendix to a Sermon on the Rule of Faith, p. 6. sqq.

"the Sacraments, and of other my doctrine, *whatsoever* "*it be*, not only I mean and judge, as the Catholic "Church and the most holy Fathers of old meant and "judged, but also I would gladly use the same words "that they used, and not use any other words; but "to set my hand to all and singular their speeches, "phrases, ways and forms of speech, which they do "use in their treatises upon the Sacraments, and to "keep still their interpretation."

And hence our Divines fearlessly appeal to the whole period when the Church was one, and spake one language, and could speak as one: as Bishop Jewell in his celebrated challenge[1]: "I said, perhaps "boldly, as it might then seem to some men, but as "I myself and the learned of our adversaries them- "selves do well know, sincerely and truly, that none "of them all, that this day stand against us, are able "or shall ever be able to prove against us any one "of all those points, either by the Scriptures, or by "example of the primitive Church, or by the old "Doctors, or by the ancient general Councils.—

"The words that I then spake, as near as I can "call them to mind, were these: If any learned man "of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men "that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient "sentence out of an old Catholic Doctor, or Father,

[1] Sermon preached at Paul's Cross, (Works, pp. 57, 58.) extracted more at length in Tracts for the Times, No. 78. "Testimony of writers in the latter English Church to the duty of maintaining *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est.*"

"or out of an old general Council, or out of the "Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of "the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly "and plainly proved, that there was any private mass "in the whole world at that time, for the space of "six hundred years after Christ; or that there was "then any communion ministered unto the people "under one kind; or that the people had their "common prayers then in a strange tongue, that "they understood not: or that the Bishop of Rome "was then called an universal Bishop, or the head of "the universal Church, &c.; if any man alive were "able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear "or plain cause or sentence, either of the Scriptures "or of the old Doctors, or of any old general Council, "or by any example of the primitive Church: I "promised then that I would give over and subscribe "unto him." . . . . .

"Besides all that I have said already, I will say "further, and yet nothing so much as might be said. "If any one of all our adversaries be able clearly "and plainly to prove, by such authority of the "Scriptures, the old Doctors and Councils, as I said "before, that it was then lawful for the Priest to "pronounce the words of consecration closely and in "silence to himself, &c. &c.—if any one of all our "adversaries be able to vouch any one of all these "articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scrip-"tures, Doctors, or Councils, as I have required, as "I said before, so say I now again, I am content to

"yield unto him and to subscribe. But I am well "assured that they shall never be able truly to allege "one sentence. And because I know it, therefore "I speak it lest ye haply should be deceived."

Nor do we in this, nor did they, approximate to Romanism; but rather they herein took the strongest and the only unassailable position against it. Rome and ourselves have alike appealed to the authority of "the Church;" but, in the mouth of a Romanist the Church means, so much of the Church as is in communion with herself, in other words, it means herself; with us, it means the Universal Church, to which Rome, as a particular Church, is subject, and ought to yield obedience. With Rome, it matters not whether the decision be of the Apostolic times, or of yesterday; whether against the teaching of the early Church, or with it; whether the whole Church universal throughout the world agree in it, or only a section, which holds communion with herself: she, as well as Calvin, makes much of the authority of the Fathers, when she thinks that they make for her; but she, equal with the founder of the Ultra-Protestants, sets at nought their authority, so soon as they tell against her: she unscrupulously sets aside the judgment of all the Ancient Doctors of the Church, unhesitatingly dismisses the necessity of agreement even of the whole Church at this day, and proudly taking to herself the exclusive title of Catholic, sits alone a Queen in the midst of the earth, and dispenses her decrees from herself. No,

my Lord! they ill understand the character of Rome, or their own strength, who think that she would really commit herself, as Cranmer did, to Christian Antiquity, or who would not gladly bring her to that test! What need has she of Antiquity, who is herself infallible, except to allure mankind to believe her so? "I, for my part," says one of no mean note among them[1], "to speak candidly, would rather credit "one Pope, in matters touching the mysteries of "the Faith, than a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, or "Gregories. For I believe and know that the sove-"reign Pontiff cannot err in things, which belong to "the Faith, because the Church's power of determin-"ing what relates to the Faith, resides in the Pontiff. "So then the error of the Pontiff would be the "error of the Universal Church. But the Universal "Church cannot err. Tell me not of a Council," &c.

This is the very complaint, which our Divines always brought against her controversialists. Thus Bp. Jewell[2]: "But one thing especially much mis-"liketh M. Harding above all the rest; that, the "better to disclose the deformities and weakness of "his doctrine, I have alleged so many Canonists "and school Doctors. For all those he weigheth no "better now than Esop's fables. And therefore he "saith, 'As for the gew-gaws of the schoolmen and

[1] Corn. Mussus, Bp. of Bitonto, quoted by Mr. Newman, Romanism and popular Protestantism, Lect. 2. "on Romanism as neglectful of Antiquity," p. 98.

[2] Preface to Defence of the Apology.

"canonists, I despise them utterly.' Are all the "school-doctors and canonists now become *intesta-* "*biles, i. e.* so far out of credit, so infamous and so "vile, that they may not be allowed to bear witness? "Whose then are they? Are they not all M. "Harding's own doctors? Is he now ashamed of his "own?—And yet will he suddenly condemn them "all, every one, by one sentence, Abbots, Bishops, "Archbishops, Decrees, Decretals, Cardinals, Saints, "and Popes and all together! But we must "pardon M. Harding; he dealeth indifferently "and is nothing partial. For even with the like "reverence he useth all the ancient Doctors of "the Church, and others of later time, that fight "on his side, and are allied to him. 'Tertullian,' "he saith, 'was an heretic, and wrote this or that "in defence of his heresy.' 'St. Cyprian,' he saith, "'had an ill cause, and defended a falsehood, and "was driven to the very same shifts whereunto all "hereticks are driven.' 'It seemeth,' said he, 'St. "Jerome was deceived by a rumour,' &c. &c. Thus, "we see, M. Harding has a commission to control "all manner of Doctors whatsoever, Greeks, Latins, "Old, New, his own and others, if they come not "readily to his purpose. Nicolaus Cusanus[1] saith, "'Pope Eugenius tells us this thing is true, if he "will have it true, and not otherwise.'"

The Anglican Divines, then, whom we follow as the

[1] De Concordan. ii. c. 20.

expositors of the meaning of our Church, differ from Rome in the following points. *They* appeal to the authority of the Universal Church, as long as it was one; Rome, to the Church, ancient or modern, in communion with herself: *they*, to the *consent* of the Early Church, however it be ascertained; Rome, to the decision of Councils confirmed by the Bishop of Rome: *they* rest on it as bearing testimony to an Apostolic origin; Rome, as the result of her own infallibility: *they* hold that the Universal Church is only a witness to the Catholic truth, and has no power of forming new articles of faith; Rome, that even the Modern Church in communion with herself, has that power: *they*, that the Church is a witness; Rome, that she is a judge: *they*, that the more recent may not contradict the ancient; Rome, that she may, and may correct them: *they*, that the meaning of Holy Scripture, of which the Church is the interpreter, must always be one and the same, to be collected from "the agreement of the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops;" Rome, that the Church may, under different circumstances, affix different meanings, and that the meaning last affixed supersedes the former[1]: *they*, in a word, seek for a

[1] See the remarkable extract from Card. Cusa in Mr. Newman's Romanism, &c. Lect. 2, "on Romanism as neglectful of Antiquity," p. 97, *note*. Here a few sentences may be extracted; his task is to defend the Council of Constance for refusing the cup to the laity, contrary to our Lord's institution and the practice of antiquity, as itself acknowledged. "Let it not disturb thee, that "at different times, the rites of sacrifices and even of sacraments

genuine Apostolic tradition, to be established by the consent of all times, all Churches, and the great Doctors of all those Churches; Rome (like Ultra-Protestants) follows modern traditions, assumes them to be Apostolic, simply because she holds them, and she is infallible; and so was the ancient Church, in communion with Rome; and so she must have taught then the same as Rome does now. And thus she brings in her modern corruptions, against which the appeal to Christian Antiquity is the surest safeguard. Scriptural language she can (as did the enemy of mankind to whom she is partially in bondage,) plausibly apply: many of her chief corruptions, she (in common with Ultra-Protestants) rests on the language of Scripture, and (in common also with them) in contradiction to the ancient Church; but the appeal to Antiquity she cannot elude. It is too full, too

" are found to differ, the truth abiding the same; and that " Scriptures are *adapted to the times, and variously understood,* " being explained at one time in conformity to the rite then " universally prevalent, and again their meaning being changed " when the rite is changed. For Christ, to whom the Father hath " delivered the kingdom of heaven and earth, in both uses a sort of " economy, and either *by secret inspiration, or by a clearer expla-* " *nation, suggests what suits each distinct period.* Wherefore if " the Church's interpretation of the *same Gospel precept be* " *different now from heretofore,* yet *this sense now current in the* " *Church, being inspired for the use of the Church, as being suited* " *for the times, is to be accepted as the way of salvation. It is* " *therefore an absurd argument, to try to object to an universal* " rite of the [Roman] Church out of the writings *of their pre-* " *decessors.*"

circumstantial. No, my Lord, they only who suspect Antiquity, because it is opposed to modern and private doctrines of their own, need fear committing themselves and their Church to it; we have full confidence in our Church, and know that she can stand the test of primitive doctrine, and that Rome cannot. Rome may entice the unwary by the name of Antiquity, but she dare not pledge herself to the reality: if in name she seem to take the same ground as the Anglican Divines, she *must* differ from them. Or to look upon it in another way: Rome differs from us, *as to* the *authority* which she ascribes to tradition; she regards it as *co*-ordinate, our divines as *sub*-ordinate: as to the *way in which it is to be employed;* she, as independent of Holy Scripture, our's as subservient to, and blended with, it: *as to its limits;* she supposes that the Church of Rome has a power of imposing new articles, necessary to be believed for salvation; our's, that all such articles were comprised at first in the Creed, and that the Church has only the power of clearing, defining, and expounding these fixed articles: *as to the office of the Church therein;* Rome supposes that the Church may select of different opinions that which she judges right; our's, that she must take that which is attested by universal consent: *as to the power of the Church;* Rome supposes that the Church may stamp that as certain, which before was really uncertain; our's, that she only ascertains that to be certain which in fact was so, but had not formally been pronounced to be so:

as to the source of that power; Rome places it in her own assumed infallibility; our's, in the office of the Church, as the depository of, and witness to, the traditions confided to her; so then, beyond the name of tradition, the Church of Rome and our Divines differ in every thing besides.

It might yet be satisfactory to state two or three points bearing upon this subject:—

1st, (lest the name of tradition should appear to imply an indefinite body of truth,) as to the *subjects* comprehended in the traditions acknowledged by the Church. These, as drawn out by the learned Dean Field[1], are (1) the number and names of the authors of books divine and canonical, (2) that summary of the chief heads of Christian doctrine contained in the Apostles' Creed, (3) "The form of "Christian doctrine and explication of the several "parts thereof, which the first Christians, receiving "of the same Apostles that delivered to them the "Scriptures, commended to posterities." [Whence it was enabled to expand the Apostles' Creed into the Nicene and Athanasian.] (4) "Rites not ex- "pressly contained in Scripture, though the grounds, "reasons, or causes of their necessity, or benefit are; "as Infant Baptism." (5) The particular application of things generally ordained; "of this sort, many "think, the observation of the Lenten fast, the fast "of the fourth and sixth days of the week, and

[1] Of the Church, p. 375, extracted more fully in the Catena above quoted, p. 12—15.

"some others." Or, as Bp. Beveridge[1] states them somewhat less rigidly. (1) The inspiration of Holy Scripture. (2) Things "which, although they are "not read in express and definite terms in the Holy "Scriptures, are yet *by the common consent of all "Christians* drawn out of these Scriptures (as the "articles of the Creed). These and such like, al- "though they are not, either in the Old or New "Testament, declared in so many words or syllables, "yet have they, as founded on both, ever been agreed "on by all Christians, certain few heretics only "excepted, of whom no more account is to be had "in religion, than of monsters in nature." (3) Observances, "no where enjoined in Holy Scripture "directly and by name, yet have they, during 1400 "years from the Apostles, been every where received "into public use of the Church; nor can there be "found any Church during that period not agreeing "thereto. So that there have been, as it were, "certain *common notions* from the beginning im- "planted in the minds of all Christians, not so much "from any particular passages of Holy Scripture, as "from all; from the general scope and tenor of the "whole Gospel; from the very nature and purpose "of the religion therein established; and, finally "from the constant tradition of the Apostles, who

[1] Preface to Codex Canonum Eccl. Prim. vindicatus et illustr. translated at length, ib. p. 65 sqq.; and prefixed to the translation of the valuable Commonitory of Vincentius recently published at Oxford.

" together with the faith, propagated ecclesiastical " rites of this sort, and if I may so speak, general " interpretations of the Gospel. For on any other " supposition it would be incredible, or even impos- " sible, that they should have been received with so " unanimous a consent every where, always, and by " all." In the second class of Bp. Beveridge may be included (4) interpretations of specific passages of Holy Scripture, upon which there is universal agreement in the ancient Church.

(2) *As to the power of the existing Church;* The right of the existing Church is limited not by any arbitrary line, but by facts. (1) As to matters necessary to salvation, the whole testimony of the Church has been given, so that her office thus far of necessity has ceased [1]. The Creeds have received their completion, unless indeed some new heresy on its Articles could arise, in which case the whole Church, could it be assembled, might give witness against it. (2) In cases not so fixed, her tradition has in many cases been broken, so that she could no longer rest her decision upon her present testimony, but must collect it from those ages in which it was yet unbroken. And hence it is, not from any abstract ideal of the first ages, that our Divines appeal to the Church, " anterior to the division of the East and West."

[1] Hence the Council of Ephesus forbade any additional Creed, beside that of Nice, being " presented to those converted from Heathenism, Judaism, or any heresy." This is contravened by Rome in the formation of Pope Pius' Creed. See Perceval on the Roman Schism, p. 33.

(3) The "Indefectibility of the Church" is very different from the "Infallibility" assumed by Rome. We believe that (although Councils, which have been termed "General," or which Rome has claimed to be so, have erred,) no real Œcumenical Council ever did; *i. e.* no Council really representing the Universal Church. Our Church of old formally accepted the six Œcumenical Councils[1]; our great Divines, who may be looked upon as speaking her voice, appeal, generally, to the period comprehending these six Councils[2], as that which has authority in matters of faith. And this they do, because the Church was then one, and it was to His one Church, and as being one, that our LORD'S promise was made[3]. And now, on that ground, her functions are, in this respect, suspended; she cannot meet, as one; and this coincidence of the errors of these later days, and the interruption of her harmony, seem remarkably to illustrate this fulfilment of our LORD'S promise: particular Churches have fallen into error, because the Church has separated, and the Church is prevented

[1] In the Council of Calchuythe, A.D. 785. (ap. Perceval on the Roman Schism, p. 5.) Our Church shortly after, at the great Council at Frankfort, rejected the Pseudo Synod of Nice, together with the Bishops of Germany and France, (see Palmer on the Church, ii. 200. sqq.) This has never been rescinded, and the State recognizes four specifically, (of which the other two are supplements,) and generally "others" without defending them (1 Eliz. 1. 36.)—See also, Field and Hammond, ap. Palmer, ii. 171, 2.

[2] Newman on Romanism, Lect. 8. "Indefectibility of the Church Catholic." p. 250.

[3] See Newman, l. c. p. 243. sqq. ed. 2.

from meeting, that she may not, as a whole, fix any of these errors. What further fulfilments our LORD's promise may have hereafter, we know not; or whether the Church shall again be at one, and so be in a condition to claim it in any enlarged degree. It might be so; for although we have broken our traditions, yet might an appeal to those of the Church, when it was yet one, set at rest what now agitates us. For the present, sufficient for us, what has been bestowed in the period of her unity; the main articles of the faith have been fixed and guarded by her, and we possess them in her Creeds, and believe that the Church shall, by virtue of her SAVIOUR's promise, preserve them to the end. With this, Rome is not content; *we* take the event, (as it is ever ruled to be) as the interpreter of prophecy; *she* would bind her LORD to accomplish it in her own way; will not accept of any thing short of what seems good to her; settles that the unity essential to its acccomplishment, concentrates in herself; and in this way continues it on to the present time, applies it to every thing, great or small[1]; and so gathers the promise around and identifies it with herself, and makes it part of her state and majesty. The indefectibility of the Universal Church is to become the safeguard of the one see of Rome, and to draw all other Churches to

[1] "Our sentiment then is, that the Church absolutely cannot "err, neither in things absolutely necessary, nor in others, which "she proposes to us to be believed or done, whether they are con- "tained in Scripture or no."—Bellarm. Controv. de Eccl. iii. 14.

her footstool. This has been the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of Romanism, and her imposture, that she has claimed to herself the promise, which belonged to the whole Church. A high dignity belonged to her as the Apostolic Church of the West; and her traditions, as long as she kept them faithfully, had, naturally, a great estimation, when testimony was to be borne to Catholic truth; but she, instead of being "among the first three," would be alone; would have her voice not only essential, but alone essential; would make at all events the infallibility of a Council to depend upon the confirmation of her bishop; teaching oftentimes also that even particular Councils approved by the Pope, became infallible, or that a general Council, in itself fallible, acquired an *ex post facto* infallibility through his approval [1]. And thus, like him who was high among "the sons of God," but would be higher than his Creator made him, she

[1] "It is to be held, as of Catholic faith, that general Councils "confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff, cannot err, either in faith or "morals." Bell. Ib. ii. 2. "The 2nd Prop. 'that particular "Councils confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff, cannot err in faith "and morals,' is not equally certain, because that no Catholic "denies, whereas this some do. But I only do not affirm that "it is to be held as of Catholic Faith, because those who hold "the contrary have not *yet* been condemned by the Church as heretics."—Ib. c. 9. "General Councils, before the confirma-"tion of the Sovereign Pontiff, may err, unless the fathers in "their definitions follow the instructions of the Pontiff."—Ib. c. 11. It is enough to stamp the character of Rome, that such perverted views should be favoured by her.

fell. The promise, which was a blessing and a high privilege to the Universal Church, became a snare to her feet, who arrogantly claimed it to herself. When our LORD lodged it, through His Spirit which dwelleth in her, it was safe; she who would be wise above that which was assigned her, has for the Spirit of Truth received a lying spirit, too mighty for her to control, and by him been goaded on, to prepare for herself her own destruction. Her claim is the invention of man, not the promise of CHRIST; it bears upon it the stamp of man's contrivance, in its lust of authority, furnishing the pretext for repudiating Canons [1] of Œcumenical Councils, from which Rome, for private ends, withdrew its sanction, and making private synods into Œcumenical and infallible Councils, when its ends are thereby served, setting herself in the place of the Church universal throughout the world: it has the fruit of man's contrivance, leading that unhappy Church into presumptuous definitions of questions, against the voice of Scripture and Antiquity, or to form wrong conclusions from a partial use of either, taking from either the first support of her existing system which comes to hand, without examining carefully whether it do support her or no, as resting in fact not on Scripture or Antiquity, but on her own assumed infallibility; using unrighteous expedients, as one unaccountable and beyond questioning; rash and headstrong in her own defence (as over-confident persons

[1] *E. g.* The 28th Canon of the Council of Ephesus.

are), not giving herself leisure to consider whether she were in the right or no, but obstinately defending each point on which she was censured; and thus multiplying her own perplexities, her precarious theories, and contradictions to Antiquity and Scripture, on which she professes to rest. Thus Satan has led her to the edge of a precipice, and there, by her very claim of infallibility, holds her fast; rendering it humanly impossible for her to retreat, ready to be cast down, unless God, by an especial act of mercy, break the bond, "take[1] the prey from the mighty," and bid the "lawful captive" go free. Her vast system rests upon an assumed infallibility; she stands committed to every portion of it; and yet she cannot give account to those whom she holds captive, how they are to know that she is infallible, or in whom this infallibility resides[2]. Nevertheless she stakes her existence on the belief. The Churches under the Roman sway may purify themselves, as did we; Rome herself has no escape (sorrowful as her doom is, which she has drawn upon herself), except through such a confession as those, who have committed themselves so deeply and so presumptuously, very rarely it is to be feared, humble themselves to make. Roman infallibillity, then, has no other relation to the doctrine of Indefectibility of the Church, than that of the corruption to the

[1] Isa. xlix. 24.

[2] Newman, ib. lect. 4. "Doctrine of Infallibility politically considered," p. 150, ed. 2.

truth which it has corrupted; the Romanist theory is bound up with *her* doctrine of traditions, she limits the doctrine on the one hand to the portion of the Church in communion with her, and on the other hand extends it to all subjects which that Church may determine; the Anglican view regards the promise as belonging to the Universal Church, but restrained to those Articles of the faith which were delivered to her, and which in her real Œcumenical Councils she has defined; one may add, the Ultra-Protestant view narrows the promise, like the Church of Rome, in extent, to a handful of believing Christians, and like Rome, also, changes the subjects of the Faith, substituting a system of its own for Catholic truth; differing, as before, from Rome in this, that what Rome claims to the Churches of her own communion, it applies to individuals [1].

The contrast between the Roman claim to infallibility, and our Anglican acknowledgment of the indefectibility of the Church, has been so clearly pursued by Mr Newman [2], that I must beg permission to insert it.

"Both we and Romanists hold that the Church

[1] "When they interpret these promises, so full of exceeding "consolation, 'Lo, I am with you always,' and 'He shall guide "you into all truth,' as given to the universal Church as a whole, "not to individual Christians, what else do they than take away "from all Christians the confidence, which ought to result thence "for their encouragement?"—Calv. Institt. 4. 8. 11.

[2] L. c. "Indefectibility of Church Catholic," p. 259.

" Catholic is unerring in its declarations of faith for " saving doctrine; but we differ from each other as " to what is the faith, and what is the Church Catholic. " They maintain that faith depends on the Church, " we that the Church is built on faith. By Church " Catholic we mean the Church Universal, as de- " scended from the Apostles; they those branches " of it which are in communion with Rome. They " consider the See of St. Peter to have a promise of " permanence, we the Church Catholic and Apostolic. " Again, they understand by the Faith, whatever " the Church at any time declares to be faith; we " what it has actually so declared from the beginning. " We hold that the Church Catholic will never de- " part from these outlines of doctrine which the " Apostles formally published; they that she will " never depart in any of her acts from that entire " system, written and oral, public and private, ex- " plicit and implicit, which they received and taught; " we that she has a gift of fidelity, they of dis- " cretion."

" Again, both they and we anathematize those who " deny the Faith; but they extend the condemna- " tion to all who question any decree of the Roman " Church; we apply it to those only who deny any " article of the original Apostolical Creed. The creed " of Romanism is ever subject to increase; our's is " fixed once for all. We confine our anathema to the " Athanasian Creed; Romanists extend it to Pope " Pius's. They cut themselves off from the rest of

" Christendom; we cut ourselves off from no branch,
" not even from themselves. We are at peace with
" Rome as regards the essentials of faith; but she
" tolerates us as little as any sect or heresy. We
" admit her Baptism and her Orders; her custom is
" to rebaptize and reordain our members who chance
" to join her.

" These distinctions are sufficient for my present
" purpose, though they are only a few out of various
" differences which might be pointed out. They are
" surely portions of a real view, which, while it re-
" lieves the mind of those burdens and perplexities
" which are the portion of the mere Protestant, is
" essentially distinct from Romanism."

(4) There yet remains one other fear which I would wish to remove, namely, lest this appeal to Christian Antiquity should abate of men's reverence to their own Church. It is natural that they should dread this, who have looked upon their own Church as a modern Church. To them the authority of their own and the ancient Church must seem to stand in contrast; to us the authority of either, though not equally full, still goes in the same direction. We wish not to add any thing to our Church, but to develope what she has; it is admitted by all, that many points, being incidentally noticed in her formularies, need expansion: a modern school would wish to have this done exclusively by reference to the Reformers; we, thankfully acknowledging her to be a sound member of the Church Catholic, from which her

Liturgy is derived, would resort to the fountain whence our stream is derived, not to the channels through which it has lately passed. We would view her in relation to the whole of which she is a part, the Primitive and Apostolic Church, whence she is descended, to which she belongs, "the rock out of "which she was hewed, and the hole of the pit from "which she was digged." This has ever been our profession. "This[1] is the very chiefest advantage "which the warmest recommenders of tradition in "our Church expect from it, *viz.* that attention to it "should very much elevate men's ideas of the *exist-* "*ing* system, proving it divine in many points, where "they now ignorantly suppose it human. This, and "not the establishment of any mere theory, new or "old, is the immediate object of those who have most "earnestly urged, from time to time, the reverential "study of Christian antiquity."

Our own Church is the immediate, the Church universal the ultimate visible authority; she is to us the representative of the Universal Church, as the Church Universal is of her LORD; our own derives her authority from the Universal Church, and cannot claim any, contrary to her; we belong to her, because we were baptized in her, and she is the descendant of the primitive Church in this land, and her Bishops "the successors of the Apostles;" we receive as Articles of Faith, what she delivers to us

[1] Keble, Postscript to 3rd edit. of Sermon on Tradition, p. 62. See also Pref. to St. Augustine's Confessions, p. viii. ix.

as fixed by the Universal Church; what she has by her private judgment deduced from Holy Scripture, we teach because we also think it to be so deducible; if we did not so think, we should obey, must belong to her, but could not teach: her Sacraments we receive, because she has received the commission to impart them; her rites, because she has the power to ordain or to change them. To our own Church we owe submission; to the decisions of the Church universal, Faith.

This relation, in which we stand as members both of a particular Church, and of the "Holy Church Universal," is expressed with such pious humility by Archbishop Bramhall, that I too cannot but beg to express, in his language, what our wishes would be, as far as any of us may, or are forced to, speak of ourselves. "No[1] one can justly blame me for honour-
" ing my spiritual mother, the Church of England, in
" whose womb I was conceived, at whose breasts I
" was nourished, and in whose bosom I hope to die."
Yet though his love was to his immediate mother, his allegiance was more especially to the "mother of us all." He proceeds after a while: "Howsoever it
" be, I submit myself and my poor endeavours, first
" to the judgment of the Catholic Ecumenical essen-
" tial Church, which if some of late days have en-
" deavoured to hiss out of the Schools as a fancy, I
" cannot help it. From the beginning it was not so.

[1] Works, p. 141, quoted more fully by Mr. Newman on Romanism: Advertisement.

" And if I should mistake the right Catholic Church " out of human frailty or ignorance, (which for my " part I have no reason in the world to suspect, yet " it is not impossible when the Romanists themselves " are divided into five or six several opinions, what " this Catholic Church, or what their infallible Judge " is,) I do implicitly and in the preparation of my " mind submit myself to the True Catholic Church, " the Spouse of Christ, the Mother of the saints, " the Pillar of Truth. And seeing my adherence is " firmer to the Infallible Rule of Faith, that is, the " Holy Scriptures interpreted by the Catholic Church, " than to mine own private judgment or opinions; " although I should unwittingly fall into an error, yet " this cordial submission is an implicit retractation " thereof, and I am confident will be so accepted by " the Father of Mercies, both from me and all others " who seriously and sincerely do seek after peace and " truth.

" Likewise I submit myself to the Representative " Church, that is, a free general Council, or as general " as can be procured; and until then to the Church " of England, wherein I was baptized, or to a national " English Synod. To the determination of all which, " and each of these respectively, according to the " distinct degree of their authority, I yield a *con-* " *formity* and *compliance*, or at the least and to the " lowest of them an *acquiescence*."

I have dwelt the longer upon this subject, because

upon it some of the most vehement charges of approximating to Rome have of late been founded; it were easier to draw a parallel (as has in part been done) between the Romanist and Ultra-Protestant. (1) Both agree in appealing to *their own* interpretation of Holy Scripture against the agreement of Catholic antiquity [1]. (2) Both claim to this case

[1] See Mr. Newman on Romanism, Lect. 7.—"Instances of the abuse of private judgment," § 5, 6. where he shows that Purgatory and the Pope's Supremacy came in through misapplication of Scripture *against* tradition. In like way, the right to administer the Holy Eucharist in one kind is rested on passages of Scripture, Luke xxiv. 30. 35. Acts ii. 42. 46; xx. 7; xxvii. 35. which would be very strong, were not all tradition of all Churches for nearly thirteen centuries against it. Other instances of this abuse of Scripture argument are quoted in Mr. Newman's work. The same was observed by Bp. Jewell, who in his "Reply to Dr. Cole," (Works, p. 43.) thus puts a number of them together. "Howbeit, of such reasons ye have store enough, as I were able to show you at large, if need so required. As where ye say:

Extra de Majoritate et obedientia.	Quæ sunt potestates à Deo ordinatæ sunt: The powers that be are ordered by God:
	Ergo, The Pope is above the Emperor.
	Spiritualis à nemine judicatur: The man that is ruled by God's Spirit, is judged of no man:
Cap. unam Sanctam.	Ergo, No man may judge the Pope.
	Sancti estote, quoniam ego sanctus sum: Be ye holy, for I am holy, saith the Lord:
Innocentius dist. 82 Proposuisti:	Ergo, No married man may be a Priest.
	Christ said unto Peter, Solve pro me et te: Pay the tribute for me and thee:
Roffensis	Ergo, The Pope is head of the Church.

Durandus

the presence and infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit, the Romanist as promised to the Church, the Ultra-Protestant as promised to individuals[1].

Durandus.	Ecclesiasticus saith, In medio ecclesiæ aperuit os suum: He opened his mouth in the midst of the congregation:
	Ergo, The Priest must turn round at the midst of the Altar.
Concilium Nicneum Secundum sub Iren.	Fecit Deus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam: God made man to the image and likeness of Himself:
	Ergo, There must be images in the Church.
Concilium Basil. sub Eugenio.	Papa juratur in fidem Apostolicam: The Pope is sworn to the Apostles' faith:
	Ergo, The Church cannot err.
Concilium Rom. sub Silvestro.	Non est discipulus supra magistrum: There is no scholar above his master:
	Ergo, No man may judge the Pope.
The Canonists,	Papa est dominus omnium beneficiorum: The Pope is Lord of all benefits:
Durandus.	Ergo, He cannot commit simony, though he would.
Eckius. Dr. Cole at Westminster.	Domini est terra et plenitudo ejus: The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof:
	Ergo, The Communion cake must be made round.
	Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum: Let all spirits praise the Lord:
	Ergo, Ye must have organs in the Church.
	Lac vobis potum dedi: or, Ignorantia est mater pietatis: I gave you milk to drink; or, Ignorance is the mother of devotion:
	Ergo, The people must make their prayers in a strange tongue."

[1] *E. g.* Mr. Scott, "Force of Truth," (v. fin.) thus vindicates

(3) Both appeal (though Ultra-Protestants less now than formerly) to individual Fathers, when they make for them, and set them aside when against them[1]. (4) Both will take one Father who sides with them, against the whole stream of Antiquity if against them. (5) Both hold, that the Spirit had reserved for these later times, what he denied to the earlier; that certain truth may now be arrived at, where the Ancient Church was in doubt and error[2]; only,

his absolute certainty of the truth of the Calvinistic system—"Supposing this narration true, (for which the appeal is made to "the heart-searching God,) and supposing the promises mentioned "to be proposed to us, that we may embrace them, depend on them, "and plead them in prayer, considering the glory of the Divine "veracity as concerned in their accomplishment to every believer; "let them try whether they can possibly evade one of these two "conclusions—either that God hath failed of His promise, or that "He hath in the main, and as far as is expressed, led the author "by His Holy Spirit to the knowledge and belief of the truth." In like way, "Essays on the Church," p. 304.

[1] Thus Basnage (Hist. des Eglises Réformées, P. i. c. 6. § 4.) appeals to Clemens Romanus, in behalf of his view of justification by faith, supposing the truth to have been obscured or lost ever after in Christian Antiquity.

[2] See Mr. Newman on "Romanism." So again Bp. Jewell, l. c. "It is a world, to consider the reason ye use to prove your "purpose withal. For ye say, the Church in Christ's and the Apos-"tles' time was but an infant; but now she is well-stricken in age, "therefore she must be otherwise dieted now than she was then. "This is not the handsomest comparison that I have heard of. "For I never heard before now that Christ and His Apostles were "called infants; or that ever any man before now took upon "him to set them to school. Esay saith, that Christ should be "Pater futuri seculi; that is, the Father of the world to come,

again, the Romanist claims this enlarged illumination or inspiration to the Church ; Ultra-Protestants to Individuals. (6) Both prefer what is modern to what is ancient, what is further from the source, to what is nearer. (7) Both deeply disparage Christian antiquity. And this agreement is not accidental, but arises from the same source in each, that each has to support modern corruptions of doctrine, unknown to Christian Antiquity, and therefore appeals against her, and will not trust itself to her, as knowing beforehand that they will be condemned by her. And so it is scarcely uncharitable to suspect, that, beneath this professed and conscious dread, lest an appeal to tradition should give Rome an advantage, there lurks also a secret and unconscious or half-conscious dread for themselves : they have good reason to suspect, if they do not absolutely know, that Christian Antiquity is against them, and so they would anticipate the blow, by stifling it ; they fear that her voice should be listened to, and so would drown it, by their outcries against her ; and while they close the ear

" which is the time of the Gospel. And St. Hierom, in your " own Decrees, calleth the Apostles, Patres, that is, not infants, " but the Fathers of the Church. And I believe, though ye " would study and labour for it, yet would it be very hard for " you, either to find out any good substantial reason, wherefore " ye with your brethren ought to be called the Fathers of God's " Church, or Christ and His Apostles ought to be called babes. " O that ye would indifferently compare the one with the other ! " ye should find, that as like as ye and your Bishops are to the " Apostles, so like is your Church to the Apostles' Church."

against her, as if she would give witness for Rome, which she would not give, they hope to escape hearing the testimony which she would give against the Anti-sacramental system of Geneva.

But this is an alarming course, and the irreverential spirit in which it is begun, bodes but ill of its termination. It were an ungrateful task, were any to set themselves systematically to show that Christian Antiquity were not to be trusted; yet this would require patience and research; but what must one think of the piety and reverence, which would make sport with the supposed defects of the Fathers of the Church, and discover their father's shame; which would repeat from mouth to mouth the one or other saying, which themselves had first misunderstood and distorted, in order triumphantly to ask, what could be thought of the judgment of men who could so speak? Truly, it seems like the Philistines making sport with the mighty man whose eyes they had first put out, and likely to meet with their end. It was scarcely in so irreverential, but in the same sceptical spirit, that Semler, the parent of German Neology, began unravelling the belief of his country: but the criticism of the Fathers mounted up to the criticism of the Apostles; and the criticism of the Apostles to that of their LORD; and the disbelief in their LORD is in its last stage become a dethroning of GOD, and a setting up of self, a Pantheism which worships GOD as enshrined in self.

This subject, upon which I have detained your

Lordship so long, may also, as the first instance of the supposed Romanist tendency of some principles of our great Divines, illustrate how mistaken is the ground of these vague fears. Opposed errors will often meet: truth will not approximate to either, though if looked upon on either side, it will seem to be nearer to the opposite than these are to each other. The proverbial truth tells us "extremes meet," as in this case also is verified; whereas the mean which our Church holds will never meet with either extreme; they parted off from it; and however slight the original divergence, become more and more widely separated from it, and never again join. To a careless or superficial thinker, the mean seems likely to join the extreme, because it has in it some quality which is wanting to the other extreme; but it is not so; it agrees with the extreme, not in essentials, but in something incidental: the rash man appears to have one quality in common with the brave one, in that he exposes himself to danger; the brave man's caution may readily appear like cowardice; and so the rash thinks the brave cowardly, and the coward holds him to be rash; whereas the exposing himself to danger or no, is but an accident; the principle on which he does it, or refrains from it, is that which constitutes his character; he then will neither be rash nor cowardly; but the coward will be rash, and the rash will be cowardly, if emergencies so determine. Prodigality and avarice seem to be contraries; yet are they continually united, as in Catiline, "*alieni appetens*,

sui profusus :" he who is simply liberal, will be neither, though by either extreme he will be confounded with the other. "Extremes meet," because they proceed on no settled principle, but on passion; they are guided by no internal rules, but are blown about, this way or that, by the force of outward circumstances; the mean goes on fixed principles, and therefore holds on an even course, undeviating and therefore never approximating to either extreme. And so our English Church has by the Church of Rome been confounded with Ultra-Protestants, and by Ultra-Protestants has ever been thought to approximate to Rome. In the present instance, it is but accident that Rome appeals to Antiquity, or Ultra-Protestantism to Scripture; both have an ulterior object, to maintain their own system: but Romanism will found its errors on Scripture, or will disparage Christian Antiquity with Ultra-Protestantism. And Ultra-Protestantism, in its turn, will neglect the plain meaning of Scripture, or appeal to Christian Antiquity, to establish views formed independently of Antiquity; whereas the genuine English system, being founded on Holy Scripture as interpreted by Christian Antiquity, possesses a deep reverence for Scripture as the source of the Faith, and for Antiquity as its witness and expositor; and appealing to both, for the office assigned to them by Him who gave them, has only so much in common with either extreme that it holds the truth which they have perverted, but approximates in no way to their errors.

Art. XI. *Of the Justification of Man.*

"Justification" having been lately the subject of a very elaborate and meditative work by one [1] of those accused of departing from the Articles [2], it is the less necessary to trouble your Lordship with any lengthened detail upon it. Had they who bring charges, studied and mastered it, they might have been benefitted by it, and these charges been spared. The XIth Article bears the appearance, on its very face, of being a protest against Romish error; it does not pretend to embrace in a few lines the whole subject of justification; it contents itself with securing one main point; it puts in strong contrast the merits of CHRIST and the merits of man, and says, that we are justified solely for the sake of His merit, and not for our own works and deservings; and that merit, it further says, is made available to us through faith. "We are accounted righteous before God, only *for* "the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ *by* "Faith, and not *for* our own works or deservings. "Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a "most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, "as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Jus- "tification." The Article then, opposes the merit of CHRIST to any thing which we have of our own, to "our own works and deservings," as the *meritorious* cause of salvation: and thus far, we believe, little is

[1] Mr. Newman's Lectures on Justification.

[2] See Preface, Edit. 4.

imputed to us. It is so plain a truth, and has been so often inculcated by us, that every sin of man which is remitted, is remitted only for the sake of His meritorious Cross and Passion, every good and acceptable work is such through His power working in us, that little, I believe, has thus far been objected. The objections have been founded, not on the Article, but on men's inferences from it. The Article opposes "Faith" as the origin of our justification, to works: it excludes works from being any meritorious cause of justification; "faith only" means in its language "faith, not works." A modern school has very strangely extended the reference of the Article, and opposed man's faith to the Sacrament of His LORD. They say, "faith only" means, that Faith, —as opposed to every thing else, not works only, but Baptism,—is *the* channel whereby the merits of CHRIST are conveyed to the soul to its justification.

But, my Lord, such a contrast was plainly neither in the minds of the writers of the Article, nor is it in their words; the whole subject of Baptism was altogether foreign to that which is handled in *this* whole series of articles on the relation of faith to works, before and after justification; (ix—xvii.) the writers specify what they do mean; they exclude man's works; they refer every thing to the merits of CHRIST: "by faith only" excludes, then, man's works, not any thing which is not man's. Whether He be pleased to convey justification directly to the believer's soul, or through His own ordinance of Bap-

tism, is wholly foreign to their subject. They say nothing about it one way or other, as neither had they any occasion, since the questions which have so agitated us of late, as to the efficacy of Baptism, had not then been raised in our Church. Neither again, does the Article say any thing about the means whereby man is retained in a justified state, nor wherein our justification consists; so that it may be perfectly true, that we are "justified by faith only," as the means whereby *we* receive it, and yet through Baptism as the means or channel, through which GOD conveys it; or "by the Spirit" as the sanctifying Presence which makes us acceptable in GOD's sight; or "by works," as St. James says, as that by which the Justification is continued on in us; or, as it has lately been very concisely and clearly expressed[1], "Justification comes *through* the Sacra-
" ments; is received *by* faith, *consists* in God's inward
" Presence, and *lives* in obedience."

The same is in part expressed by one who was in his day a pillar of our Church against heresy[2]. "The
" merits of Christ *applied in* Baptism *by the Spirit*,
" and *received by a lively faith*, complete our justifi-
" cation for the time being." As well then might it be inferred that "justification by faith only" excluded the indwelling of the Spirit, on its first imparting,

[1] Newman on Justification, Lect. 12. "Faith viewed relatively to rites and works," p. 318.

[2] Waterland on Justification, quoted by Mr. Newman, p. 154, note.

or good works as necessary to its continuance, as that it excludes Baptism as the channel whereby God bestows it. Whatever charge then is conceived to lie against this view will equally hold against the earlier Non-conformists [1], who had not reduced Justification to a mere imputation, but regarded it as resulting from the indwelling of the Spirit. In Mr. Newman's words [2], on the relation of Justification by faith to Justification by works, "If indeed I said that works "justify in *the same sense* as faith only justifies, this "would be a contradistinction in terms; but faith "only may justify in one sense, good works in another, "and this is all that is here maintained. After all, "does not Christ only justify? How is it that the "doctrine of faith justifying does not interfere with "our Lord's being the sole justifier? It will of "course be replied, that our Lord is the meritorious "cause, and faith the means; that faith justifies in "a different and subordinate sense. As then Christ "justifies *in the sense* in which He justifies, alone, "yet faith also justifies in its own sense; so works, "whether moral or ritual, may justify us in their "own respective senses, though in the sense in which "faith justifies it only justifies.—Indeed, is not this "argument, as has been suggested already, the very "weapon of the Arians in their warfare against the "Son of God? They said, Christ is not God, be-

[1] *E. g.* Baxter quoted by Mr. Newman, l. c.

[2] Lect. xii. "Faith viewed relatively to Rites and Works," p. 316.

"cause the Father is called the *only* God." And again: "The instrumental power of Faith cannot "interfere with the instrumental power of Baptism; "because Faith is the *sole* justifier, not in contrast "to all means and agencies whatever (for it is not "surely in contrast to our Lord's merits, or God's "mercy), but to all other *graces*. When, then, "Faith is called the sole instrument, this means the "sole *internal* instrument, not the sole instrument of "any kind.

"There is nothing inconsistent, then, in Faith "being the sole instrument of justification, and yet "Baptism also the sole instrument, and that at the "same time, because in distinct senses; an inward "instrument in no way interfering with an outward "instrument[1]."

And this connection of Justification with Baptism, so far from being at variance with the homily to which the Article refers, and which men now quote in behalf of a contrary view, is implied by its very outset. For in the first words it lays down the necessity man has of a justification out of himself, which is what the Article requires. "Because all "men be sinners and offenders against God, and "breakers of His law and commandment, therefore "can no man by his own acts, works, and deeds, "(seem they never so good) be justified, and made "righteous before God; but every man of necessity

[1] Lect. x. "Justification by Faith only," p. 259.

" is constrained to seek for another righteousness or " justification to be received at God's own hands, " that is to say, the forgiveness of his sins and tres- " passes, in such things as he hath offended." Then it speaks of this justification as being bestowed by GOD, and received by faith. " And this justification " or righteousness which we so receive of God's " mercy and Christ's merits, *embraced by faith*, is taken, " accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and " full justification." And then, having named the Sacrifice of CHRIST as the *meritorious* cause of our justification, the writer proceeds: " Insomuch that " infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, " are by this Sacrifice washed from their sins, brought " to God's favour, and made His children and in- " heritors of His kingdom of heaven. And they " which in act or deed do sin after their Baptism, " when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are " likewise washed by this Sacrifice from their sins, in " such sort that there remaineth not any spot of sin, " that shall be imputed to their damnation." " Here," observes Mr. Newman [1], " is distinct mention of faith " justifying *after* Baptism, but no mention of its jus- " tifying *before* Baptism; on the contrary, Baptism " is expressly said to effect the first justification." The writer proceeds: " *This* is that justification or " righteousness which St. Paul speaks of, when he " saith, 'No man is justified by the works of the

[1] Lect. x. " Justification by Faith only," p. 263.

"Law, but freely by faith in Jesus Christ.' So it "seems that St. Paul too, when he speaks of justifi- "cation through faith, speaks of faith as subordinate "to Baptism, not as the immediate initiation into a "justified state."

So again Dr. Heylin[1] sums up this same statement of the homily: "There we find, that by God's "mercy and the virtue of that Sacrifice which our "High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son "of God, once offered for us upon the Cross, we do "obtain God's grace, and remission as well of our "original sin in Baptism, as of all actual sin com- "mitted by us after Baptism, if we truly repent and "turn unfeignedly unto Him again. Which doctrine "of the Church of England, as it is consonant to the "word of God, in Holy Scripture, so is it also most "agreeable to the common and received judgment "of pure antiquity."

The doctrine of Justification through Baptism is not opposed then to Justification by Faith only, in the sense of the Article, although it is to the theory which some have constructed upon it. "The neces- "sity of Baptism," says Bishop Bull[2], "and of those "things which prepare for Baptism, in order to "obtain remission of sins, which is set forth in "sundry places of Scripture, and occurs in almost

[1] On the Apostles' Creed, Art. x. c. vi. quoted in Catena Patrum, No. ii. Tracts, No. 76. "Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration," p. 26.

[2] Apol. pro Harmon. S. 4. § 9.

" every page of the Ancients, is alone a sufficient " argument to overthrow *that* solifidianism, which " many have attempted to build up out of Holy " Scripture and the testimonies of the Fathers; as " our most learned and pious Thorndike, of blessed " memory, has evinced in different places of his writ- " ings. For it appears hence, that Faith by itself " does not suffice to obtain justification; but that " outward Baptism is required besides, when it may " be had; but that at all events that promise of " a new life, which is wont to be made at Baptism, " is of necessity required;" and, again [1], " In the " New Testament, John Baptist is said to have been " sent by God, ' to preach the baptism of repentance " for the remission of sins,' where are set down " together the end and the means leading thereto: " the end is remission of sins or justification; the " means our Baptism and repentance."

There is, however, another wide difference between the views which we have inherited from, " to say the least, the greater number of English Divines," and those now held by a large portion of the Church, resulting from our different views of the connection of justification with Baptism. The view prevalent with this class appears to have been borrowed from Luther, and so to be nearly that condemned by the Council of Trent, that " Justifying [2] faith is nothing

[1] Ib. S. 3. § 12.

[2] Sess. 6. can. 12.

" else than a reliance (fiducia) on the Divine mercy " remitting sins for Christ's sake, or that it is this " reliance alone whereby we are justified." The Tridentine doctrine on the contrary is, that " Justifica- " tion is not merely the remission of sins, but also " the sanctification and renewal of the inward man " by his voluntary reception of grace and gifts. " Whence a man becomes righteous for unrighteous, " a friend [of God] for an enemy, so as to be an heir " according to the hope of eternal life, and the com- " munication of the merits of the Passion of our " Lord Jesus Christ. This takes place in the very " act of the justification of the ungodly, in that, " through the merit of His most Holy Passion, the " love of God is through the Holy Spirit shed abroad " in the hearts of those who are justified, and becomes " inherent in them, whence in the very act of justi- " fication, man, together with the remission of sins, " receives infused into him, through Jesus Christ, in " Whom he is engrafted, faith, hope, and charity." The Anglican doctrine [1], or that which we conceive to have been the teaching of the majority of our Church, differs from both these; from the Roman, in that it excludes sanctification from having any place in our justification; from the Lutheran, in that it conceives justification to be not imputation merely, but the act of God imparting His Divine Presence to the soul, through Baptism, and so making us temples of the

[1] Sess. 6. can. 7.

Holy Ghost, "the[1] habitation in us of God the "Father, and the Word incarnate, through the Holy "Ghost:" or to quote a fuller passage[2], "It may "be remarked that whatever blessings in detail "we ascribe to justification, are ascribed in Scrip- "ture to this sacred indwelling. For instance, is "justification *remission of sins?* the Gift of the "Spirit conveys it, as is evident from the Scripture "doctrine about Baptism; 'One Baptism for the "remission of sins.' Is justification *adoption* into the "family of God? in like manner the Spirit is ex- "pressly called the Spirit of adoption, 'the Spirit "whereby we cry, Abba, Father.' Is justification "*reconciliation* with God? St. Paul says, 'Jesus Christ "is *in* you, unless ye be reprobates.' Is justification "*life?* the same Apostle says, 'Christ liveth *in* me.' "Is justification given to *faith?* he also prays 'that "Christ may dwell in' Christians' 'hearts by faith.' "Does justification lead to holy *obedience?* Our Lord "assures us that 'he that abideth in Him and He in "him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.' Is it "through justification that we rejoice *in hope of the* "*glory* of God? in like manner 'Christ in us' is said "to be 'the hope of glory.'"

The three views of doctrine part widely in their practical effects; the Lutheran[3] view, especially as

[1] Newman on Justif. Lect. vi. "On the gift of Righteousness," p. 160.

[2] Ib. p. 166, 7.

[3] The Council of Trent condemns those who hold "that it is

developed in the Wesleyans and a section of our Church, leads men to look to their own *feelings*, as that by which their reliance on Christ may be ascertained, to analyze them, operate upon them, work them up, rely at last with satisfaction upon them, as tests of their love for CHRIST. They have been taught that justification is not the gift of GOD through His Sacraments, but the result of a certain frame of mind, of a going forth of themselves, and resting themselves upon their Saviour; this is the *act* whereby they think themselves to have been justified; and so, as another would revert to his Baptism, and his engraffing into Christ, and his thus being *in* Christ, so they do to this act whereby *they* were justified; they cherish their then feelings, not to act upon them, but for their own sakes; mourn over their fading[1]; endeavour to reproduce them; make their Christian life to concentrate in them; and lose out of sight, as carnal and legal, its ordinary, hourly duties. These tendencies, doubtless, are checked in individuals; but whatever checks

" necessary to every man to obtain remission of sins, that he " should believe assuredly and without any doubt, that the sins " of his own infirmity and indisposition are remitted to him," and " that a man is thereby absolved from sins and justified, that he " believes assuredly that he is absolved and justified, and that no " one is truly justified, unless he believes that he is justified, and " that by *this* faith alone absolution and justification are perfected." (Sess. 6. Can. 13, 14.) which is just the Wesleyan doctrine.

[1] This feeling is encouraged in popular hymns, irregularly admitted into our Churches, as in that, in other respects very

there are, are the result of past duty, of an implanted integrity, of GOD's law within them, and in our own Church, of the practical character impressed by her Liturgy, in despite of their system. Their tendency is to act upon a theory, not upon Scripture; to suppose that if the feelings be right, the acts will, as a matter of course, be right; and so to neglect that about which Scripture bids them be diligent. To take the most systematic development of this theory; the first thought which occurs to the mind of a Wesleyan, in speaking of his spiritual state, is, not what temptations he has surmounted, or failed in, what duties he has neglected, or performed, but what were his feelings. His "experience" concentrates in these.

"True faith," observes Mr. Newman[1], "is what

impressive one, "Oh for a closer walk with God." What a strong contrast with the peace resulting from continued growth in grace are such lines as:

Where is the happiness I knew
When first I knew the Lord;
And felt the heart-reviving view
Of Jesus and His word?
What peaceful hours I *then* enjoyed!
How sweet their memory still!
But *now* I feel a painful void
No human joys can fill.

Such lines would describe truly a backsliding Christian, or a dejected one, who had been taught to make his feelings the test of his state; but they are too likely to make one think himself backsliding, because his feelings are not what they were. The more practical view is given in Mr. Newman's Sermons, vol. i. "On the use of excited feelings in religion."

[1] On Justification, Lect. xiii. "On preaching the Gospel," p. 385.

" may be called colourless, like air or water; it is
" but the medium through which the soul sees
" Christ; and the soul as little really rests upon it
" and contemplates it, as the eye can see the air.
" When, then, men are bent on holding it (as it
" were) in their hands, curiously inspecting, analyz-
" ing, and so aiming at it, they are obliged to colour
" and thicken it, that it may be seen and touched.
" That is, they substitute for it, something or other,
" a feeling, notion, sentiment, conviction, or act of
" reason, which they may hang over and dote upon.
" They rather aim at experiences (as they are called)
" within them, than at Him that is without them.
" They are led to enlarge upon the signs of conver-
" sion, the variations of their feelings, their aspira-
" tions and longings, and to tell all this to others;—
" to tell others how they fear, and hope, and sin,
" and rejoice, and renounce themselves, and rest in
" Christ only; how conscious they are that they are
" but 'filthy rags,' and all is of grace, till in fact they
" have little time left them to guard against what
" they are condemning, and to exercise what they
" seem to themselves to be so full of. Now men in
" a battle are brief-spoken; they realize their situa-
" tion and are intent upon it. . . . . By-standers
" see our minds; but our minds, if healthy, see but
" the objects which possess them. As God's grace
" elicits our faith, so His holiness stirs our fear, and
" His glory kindles our love. Others may say of
" us 'here is faith' and 'there is conscientiousness'

" and ' there is love,' but we can only say, ' this is " God's grace,' and ' that is His holiness,' and ' that " is His glory.' "

Just the reverse of this is the Romanist. His theory leads men as naturally to look chiefly to their works, and as it has a Pelagian *tendency* (although it has been held together with high Augustinian doctrine) so may it readily lead them to look to their own works as their own; to weigh them, balance them, evil against good, make the one compensate for the other, settle their several values; at last, hold the ALMIGHTY their debtor, as if the more eminent saints had a supererogation of merits. " It " makes," to use Mr. Newman's [1] words, " its hea- " venly grace a matter of purchase and trade." " Romanism," as he again says [2], " by its pretence " of Infallibility, lowers the standard and quality of " Gospel obedience, as well as impairs its mysterious " and sacred character; and this in various ways. " When religion is reduced in all its parts to a " system, there is hazard of something earthly being " made the chief object of our contemplation instead " of our Maker. Now Romanism classifies our duties " and their rewards, the things to do, the modes " of pleasing God, the penalties and the remedies of " sin, with such exactness that an individual knows

[1] On Justification, Lect. viii. " Righteousness viewed as a gift and as a quality," p. 221.

[2] On Romanism, &c. Lect. iii. " Doctrine of Infallibility morally considered," p. 125.

" (so to speak) just where he is upon his journey
" heavenward, how far he is got, how much he
" has to pass, and his duties become a matter of
" calculation. It provides us with a sort of graduated
" scale of devotion and obedience, and engrosses our
" thoughts with the details of a mere system, to a
" comparative forgetfulness of its professed Author.
" But it is evident that the purest religious services
" are those which are done, not by constraint, but
" voluntarily, as a free offering to Almighty God.—
" True faith does not like to realize to itself what
" it does; it throws off the thought of it; it is
" carried on and reaches forward towards perfection,
" not counting the steps it has ascended, but keep-
" ing the end steadily in its eye, knowing only that
" it is advancing, and glorying in each sacrifice or
" service which it is allowed to offer, as it occurs,
" not remembering it afterwards. But in Romanism
" there would seem to be little room for this uncon-
" scious devotion. Each deed has its price, every
" quarter of the land of promise is laid down and
" described. Roads are carefully marked out, and
" such as would attain to perfection, are constrained
" to move in certain lines, as if there were a science
" of gaining heaven. Thus the Saints are cut off
" from the Christian multitude by certain fixed
" duties, not rising out of it by the continuous
" growth and flowing forth of services which in their
" substance pertain to all men. And Christian holi-
" ness in consequence, loses its freshness, vigour, and

" comeliness, being frozen (as it were) into certain " attitudes, which are not graceful except when un- " studied.

" The injury resulting to the multitude from the " same circumstance, is of a different but not less " serious nature. While, of those who aim at the " more perfect obedience, many are made self-satis- " fied, and still more formal, the mass of Christians are " either discouraged from attempting or countenanced " in neglecting it. If, indeed, there is one offence " more than the rest characteristic of Romanism, it " is this, its indulging the carnal tastes of the mul- " titude of men, setting a limit to their necessary " obedience, and absolving them from the duty of " sacrificing their whole lives to God."

The Anglican doctrine directs men to look neither to their faith nor their works, but to CHRIST alone, " the Author and Finisher of their faith," not staying to analyze their feelings, nor weighing their works in a balance, as if claiming Heaven either by faith or works, but looking simply to Him, striving to follow Him, to do as He bids; to act as He guides; to look off from things behind, to press forward to things before, as having Him ever before our eyes, Whose Goodness and Greatness and Holiness and Glory are immeasurable, yet Who bade us follow in His steps, and " in Whom instrengthening" (ἐνδυναμοῦντι), because indwelling, St. Paul " could do all things;" " Who [1] is our Righteousness, by

[1] Newman on Justif. Lect. vi. " On the gift of Righteousness," p. 167.

" dwelling in us by the Spirit; justifies us by entering " into us; continues to justify us by remaining in us. " This is really and truly our justification, not faith, " not holiness, [with the Romanist] not (much less) " a mere imputation [with the Lutheran], but through " God's mercy, the very Presence of Christ."

I would not be understood to rest the defence of any doctrine, in any degree, upon its apparent tendencies; we are not judges of them; and might readily mistake them; and certainly should, if we would on any such *à priori* grounds decide doctrines to be scriptural or unscriptural; yet, being persuaded that this doctrine is both Scriptural and Catholic, we may speak of its tendencies, with a view to abate a prejudice against it. And in this view the writer so often quoted contrasts it with those of Romanism and Ultra-Protestantism.

" I say[1] the view of justification taken by Roman- " ists and by a school of divines among ourselves, " tends to fix the mind on self, not on Christ, whereas " that which I have advocated as Scriptural and " Catholic, buries self in the absorbing vision of a " present, an indwelling God. And as so doing, it " is a more awakening and fearful doctrine even than " that mode of teaching which insists mainly and di- " rectly on our responsibilities and duties. For to " what does it point as the great and immediate con- " dition of justification? to faith and holiness of our

[1] Lect. viii. " Righteousness viewed as a gift and a quality," p. 220.

" own? or, on the other hand, to the mere title of
" righteousness, which cannot be literally approached
" or profaned by us? no,—but to the glorious She-
" kinah of the Word Incarnate, as to the true wed-
" ding garment in which the soul must be dressed.
" Does not such a view far increase, instead of di-
" minishing our responsibilities, does it not make us
" more watchful and more obedient, while it comforts
" and transports us? Surely it takes our minds off
" ourselves in order to fill us with triumph, awe, and
" godly fear at what we are and what we hold within
" us. When are we the more likely to dread sinning,
" when we know merely we ought to dread it, or
" when we see the exceeding peril of it? When are
" we the more likely to keep awake and be sober,
" when we have a present treasure now to lose, or a
" distant reward to gain? Is it not more dreadful,
" when evil thoughts assail us, more elevating and
" ennobling in affliction, more kindling in danger
" and hardship, to reflect (if the words may be said),
" that we bear God within us, as the Martyr Ignatius
" expresses it, that He is grieved by us or suffers
" with us according as we carry or renounce His
" Cross,—I say, has not this thought more of per-
" suasiveness in it to do and suffer for Him than the
" views of doctrine which have spread among us? Is
" it not more constraining than that which considers
" that the Gospel comes to us in name, not in power;
" deeper, and more sacred than a second, which
" makes its heavenly grace a matter of purchase and

" trade; more glowing than a third, which depresses " it almost to the chill temperature of natural re- " ligion?"

I cannot refrain from adding one more passage, in which he winds up his glowing rehearsal of the devotions of the early Christians, whose life was faith, and their faith, not a speculation, but their life:

" They[1] had Christ before them; His thought in " their minds, His emblems in their eye, His Name " in their mouths, His service in their postures, mag- " nifying Him, and calling on all that lives to magnify " Him, joining with angels in heaven and saints in pa- " radise to bless and praise Him for ever and ever. O " great and noble system, not of the Jews who rested " in their rites and privileges, not of Christians who " are taken up with their own feelings, and who de- " scribe what they should exhibit, but of the true " Saints of God, the undefiled and virgin souls who " follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth? Such " is the difference between those whom Christ praises " and those whom He condemns or warns. The Pha- " risee recounted the signs of God's mercy upon and " in him; the Publican simply looked to God. The " young Ruler boasted of his correct life, but the " penitent woman anointed Jesus' feet and kissed " them; nay, holy Martha herself spoke of her " 'much service;' while Mary waited on Him for " the 'one thing needful.' The one thought of them-

[1] Lect. xiii. " On Preaching the Gospel," p. 388.

" selves; the others thought of Christ. To look at " Christ is to be justified by faith; to think of being " justified by faith is to look from Christ and to fall " from grace. He who worships Christ and works " for Him is acting that doctrine which another does " but enunciate; his worship and his works are acts " of faith, and avail to his salvation, because he does " not do them *as* availing."

Art. XVI. *Of sin after Baptism.*

From this difference in the view of Justification, it could not be, but that there should be a material difference as to the view of sin after Baptism. And the charges on this subject relate simply to myself. Some, I believe, have gone so far as to imply that I contravene the Article, although I prefaced what I said with a statement in its very words; others allege only that my statements interfere, according to their view, with the doctrine of justification by faith. And this could not be otherwise. For in that they sever Justification from Baptism, and make it to consist in the "*act* of reliance upon the merits of Christ only," sin, according to them, is forgiven, *at once*, upon each renewal of this act: and in that they thus virtually substitute this act for Baptism, a man has thereupon no more to do with his past sins, than, according to the doctrine of the Church, he has with those remitted by Baptism. Since, moreover, they identify this act with Justification, then a man's justification is renewed, so often as this act is renewed:

and if any one denies that a man is *forthwith* completely justified, it is, with them, all one with denying that he is "justified by faith only." I say this, by way of explaining how one who takes this view of justification must, if he judge another by his principles, do him injustice unintentionally; he cannot understand how our own merits and deservings are not introduced into the act of justification. On the other hand, according to our Church, we are by Baptism brought into a state of salvation, or justification (for the words are thus far equivalent), a state into which we were brought of GOD's free mercy alone, without works, but in which having been placed, we are to "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling," through the indwelling Spirit of "God, working in us to will and to do of His good "pleasure;" a *state* admitting of degrees, according to the degree of sanctification; (although the first *act*, whereby we were brought into it, did not) a state admitting of relapses and recoveries, but which is weakened by every relapse; injured by lesser, destroyed for the time by grievous sin [1]; and after such sin recovered with difficulty, in proportion to the greatness of the sin, and the degree of its wilfulness, and of the grace withstood.

Now all this does not lie within the scope of the Article; the Article expressly condemns persons holding two opposite errors, "those which say they can no more sin as long as they live here," and

[1] See Preface, Edit. 4.

" those who deny the place of forgiveness to such as *truly* repent." But who "*truly* repent;" what are helps towards *true* repentance; when a man, who has been guilty of "deadly sin wilfully committed after Baptism," may be satisfied that he is truly repentant for it; whether and to what degree he should, all his life after, continue his repentance for it; whether he be altogether pardoned, or whether only so long as he continue in a state of penitence; wherein his penitence should consist; whether continued repentance would efface the traces of his sin in himself; whether he might ever in this life look upon himself as restored to the state in which he had been, had he not committed it; whether it affect the degree of his future bliss, or its effects be effaced by his repentance, but their extinction depend upon the continued greatness of his repentance; whether cessation of his active repentance may not bring back degrees of the sin upon him; whether it shall appear again in the day of judgment: these and the like, are questions upon which the Article does not speak, but upon which a modern popular theology has decided very peremptorily, and will have no interference with its decrees. According to it, the whole office of repentance is to bring men to CHRIST, the terrors of the law are to drive men to dread the punishment due to their sins, to renounce them, to seek for reconciliation through the free mercy of CHRIST; and so far is, of course, true; but when men have thus been brought to "lay hold of His

saving merits," then, according to them, their sins are done away; they "are covered[1];" they can appear no more; "the handwriting is blotted out;" a man has no more to do with them than to thank CHRIST that he has been delivered from them. This "apprehension of Christ's merits" is to them instead of Baptism, a full remission of sins, completely effacing them; and so often as any man embraces those merits, so often, according to them, are his sins effaced. To revert to past sin, is to doubt of CHRIST'S mercy; to bear a painful recollection of it, is to be under the bondage of the law; to seek to efface it by repentance, is weakness of faith; to do acts of mercy, or self-denial, or self-abasement, or to fast, with reference to it, is to interfere with the "freeness and fulness of the Gospel;" to insist upon them, is "to place repentance instead of Christ." This system has but two topics, "repent, and believe the Gospel;" and so far right; but these two so narrowed, that repentance is to precede faith, faith to supersede repentance. Other offices of repentance, it scarcely entertains in thought, except to denounce, or to scoff at[2].

It was against this system, my Lord, that I spoke: this abuse of the doctrine of justification by faith is searing men's consciences now, as much as the "indulgences" of the Romish system did before.

[1] Ps. xxxii. 2.

[2] *E. g.* in the way in which certain acts of self-discipline instanced from Bp. Taylor, in Tract 66, p. 8, have been jeered at.

It used to be said that the "Romish was an easy religion to die in;" but even the Romish, in its corruptions, scarcely offered terms so easy, at all events made not a boast of the easiness of its terms; if it had but the dregs of the system of the ancient Church, stale and unprofitable as these often were, they had yet something of the strength or the bitterness of the ancient medicine; they, at least, testified to a system, when men made sacrifices for the good of their souls, humbled themselves in dust and ashes; practised self-discipline; "accused [1] and condemned "themselves, that so they might find mercy at their "heavenly Father's hand for Christ's sake, and not "be accused and condemned in that fearful judg-"ment;" felt "the remembrance" of their past sins to be "grievous [2] unto" them, "the burthen" to be "intolerable;" "were grieved and wearied with the burthen of their sins;" "turned [3] to God in weeping, fasting, and praying;" "bewailed [3] and lamented their "sinful life, acknowledged and confessed their of-"fences, and sought to bring forth worthy fruits of "penance;" and in cases of notorious sin, were "put [3] "to open penance, and punished in this world, that "their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord." The sun of the ancient Church was setting, sadly obscured by the mists and vapours of earth which had gathered round it; yet it did occasionally gleam through on the eye, which watched constantly for it

[1] Visitation of the Sick. [2] Communion Service.
[3] Commination Service.

behind these mists; and even to these clouds which half hid it, it imparted oftentimes its own, though a melancholy lustre. Romanism was, in practice as well as in doctrine, decayed; yet to those who "loved the stones and pitied the dust" of the ancient city of GOD, its very ruins marked the outline, which they might trace out for themselves: treasures were buried there for those, who would clear away the heaps, which decay accumulated over them. To the many, her's was a debasing system, yet there might be, and was often, reality in it, to those who would find it.

The refined distinctions, which she made in carrying out her divisions of mortal and venial sins; her accurate allotment of punishments (as if she could measure out the degree of guilt contracted by each offence against GOD); her inventions of attrition and contrition; the assumption of an absolute power to remit altogether venial, and the eternal consequences of mortal sins; not to speak now of the sale [1] of indulgences or the commutation of penance for money; these favoured the corruptions of carnal men [2], stifled

[1] The *sale* of indulgences was prohibited by the Council of Trent (Sess. xxi. c. 9, de reformat.) "that all might *at length* truly understand that these heavenly treasures of the Church were employed not for gain but for piety," and the extent of grievous corruptions admitted; their use, as a means of power, is continued. See quotations in Mr. Newman, on Romanism, Lect. iv. "Doctrine of Infallibility politically considered," p. 145. ed. 2.

[2] See more fully Newman on Romanism, Lect. iii. "Doctrine of Infallibility morally considered," p. 113, sqq. ed. 2.

the misgivings which might awaken them from their security, lowered the tone and standard, whereat they were to aim, and threw them on the Church, to whom the dispensation of those treasures of mercy were committed, rather than on Him, in whose name she dispensed them. She took upon herself the office of the Judge, anticipated His sentence, and stood in His place. Such were the effects of her portion of it, its corruptions; but insomuch as she retained from Antiquity, the system bore witness to the holiness of God; the grievousness of offending Him; the "earnestness, indignation, fear, vehement longing, zeal, revenge," which the Apostle [1] says "godly sorrow worketh;" it spoke of holier times and holier practices than it realized or encouraged, to those who had ears to hear. But this modern system, whose very boast it is to make works of no account [2]; which teaches people on their death-bed, after a life of profligacy and infamy, servants of sin and Satan, destroying, as far as in them lay, the souls of others, to put away all painful remembrance of past sin, and to exult and triumph in having cast away "their righteousness" (which they had not) "like filthy rags,"

[1] 2 Cor. vii. 10, 11.

[2] Thus a very popular and in many respects valuable account of the destruction of a vessel, speaking of the apparent conversion of some, under the immediate prospect of sudden death, appealed strongly to this proof of the value of faith without works. "What," it said, "would they have done, who make salvation depend in any degree upon works in such a case, when there was no time to perform them?"

and to joy as though they had "fought the good fight," and been approved soldiers; which would make it practically easier, and safer almost, to be saved without works than with them, speaking often of the danger of relying upon works, and but little of the danger of being lost for want of them; which stifles continually the strong emotions of terror and amazement which GOD has wrought upon the soul, and "healing slightly the wound" which he has made, makes it often incurable; which makes peace rather than holiness, the end of its ministrations, and by an artificial wrought-up peace, checks the deep and searching agony, whereby GOD, as in a furnace of fire, was purifying the whole man, "by the Spirit of judgment, and by the Spirit of burning"—this is altogether a spurious system, misapplying the promises of the Gospel, usurping the privileges of Baptism, which it has not to confer, giving peace which it has not to bestow, and going counter to the whole tenor of Scripture, "that every man shall be judged according to his works."

This system, however it differs from Romanism in the means, agrees with it in the end, in lulling the conscience, ridding man (as he craves to be,) of all anxieties as to his past life, permitting him to forget his past sins; and that without exercising the self-discipline, which Romanism, when not altogether corrupt, still encourages.

Our Church, my Lord, here as elsewhere, appears to me to hold a distinct line, however she has not

been able as yet to revive the "godly discipline" which she feelingly deplores. Romanism, as well as Ultra-Protestantism, practically frees a man from his past sins; our Church bids him confess that he is "tied[1] and bound with the chain" of them, and to pray Him that "the pitifulness of His great mercy may loose us;" she teaches us, in her daily service, to have our "sins *ever* before us," that so GOD may "hide His face from our sins, and blot out all our iniquities;" she bids us come day by day with "broken and contrite hearts" which GOD "will not despise;" to "rend our hearts" that "God may repent him of the evil;" to seek of GOD "correction," though "with judgment, not in His anger;" to go daily to our Father, and say unto Him that we are "no more worthy to be called His sons." She teaches us daily to confess all the sins of our past life; all our past "erring and straying," our *having* "offended against His holy laws," *having* "left "undone what we ought to have done, and done what "we ought not to have done;" three times a week she teaches us to pray to be delivered "from His wrath and from everlasting damnation," and "in the day of judgment;" that He would give us "true repentance, forgive us *all* our sins, negligences, and ignorances." And in her most solemn service, she would have us approach with "true penitent hearts;" still gathering before our eyes, all the sins of our past lives, that

[1] This prayer was objected to by the Puritans, and consistently with their system. Their objection shows the more how much of doctrine is contained in our ancient prayers, that they do breathe a different moral spirit.

"the remembrance of them" being "grievous unto us, and the burthen of them intolerable," we may bring them all before Him, pray Him, "for Jesus Christ's sake to forgive us *all* that is past."

In the solemn service, again, with which this season has just begun, she "admonishes us of the *great* indignation of God against sinners," that "we may the rather be moved to *earnest* and true repentance;" and then, after most deep confession of sins, gives us not peace herself, but prays, in the words which He placed in the mouths of His priests to bless, "the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon us and give us peace." She guides us from herself, either preaching or blessing, to Him who is "the merciful receiver of all true penitent sinners," and to His untold, unfathomable, mercies in CHRIST JESUS; she would have us continually lean on His mercy, not as confident that our sins were already blotted out, but rather as beholding ourselves "full of" all "the sores" which by our past sins we had inflicted upon our souls, yet trusting that His mercy will yet be greater than our sins; striving to cleanse ourselves, yet awaiting to the end His gracious sentence, whereby He shall say, "I will, be thou clean," and "deliver us from the extreme "malediction which shall light upon them that shall "be set on the left hand, and set us on His right "hand, and give us the gracious benediction of His "Father, commanding us to take possession of His "glorious kingdom." And so she continues even to the end: she exhorts us *all* twice every day, after her

Absolution, to beseech GOD to "grant us true repentance"—a truer and deeper repentance than we have;—prays for it in the Litany, in connexion with our *past* "sins, negligences, and ignorances;" prays again throughout Lent that (what a modern system looks upon as taking place once only in life) "God "would *create* and make in us *new* and contrite "[broken] *hearts;* that we *worthily* lamenting our "sins, and acknowledging our wretchedness," &c. and thus, to the verge of the grave, or whenever sickness brings death and judgment in nearer sight, she not only exhorts *all* "truly to repent," but prays for them that "the sense of their weakness may add "strength to their faith, and *seriousness* to their re-"pentance." She would have both deepened in us to our last breath, that we may in penitent trust close our eyes and approach the Judge of all—with the words of that great example of humble repentance and exceeding faith, "Lord, remember me when "Thou comest into Thy kingdom." The very titles with which she accompanies the name of repentance show how deep and earnest her views of repentance are; she never names it without some word to express its reality. Thus she speaks again and again of "*true* repentance[1];" "and *seriousness* to repentance[2];" "*unfeigned* repentance[2];" "*earnest* and true repent-

[1] Twice in the Daily Absolution, in Visitation of the Sick (where it occurs three times, being omitted in the prayers for persons troubled in mind or in conscience); Litany; Commination Service, twice.

[2] Visitation of the Sick.

ance[1];" "with *all* contrition[1]:" "*faithful* repentance[1];" and in her service of most solemn joy, the Communion of her LORD, she comes most broken-hearted; she has there her deepest confession of guilt, and there she most accumulates these titles. Its unspeakable blessings she sets forth, having first said, "if with "a *true* penitent heart—we receive that Holy Sacra- "ment: for *then*," &c.; then she exhorts us, "repent "you *truly* of your sins past—so shall ye be made "partakers," &c.; then placing that confession in our mouths, she invites us with the words, "Ye that do *truly* and *earnestly* repent you of your sins;" then pronounces her absolution upon us, as such as "with *hearty* repentance turn unto Him:" so that her address, "Hear what comfortable words our Saviour "Christ saith unto all that *truly* turn to Him: 'Come "unto Me, all ye that travail, and are heavy laden, "and I will refresh you,'" sounds indeed most comfortably. Her sense of the awful privileges of the Communion, and her own manifold unworthiness, and deep expressions of repentance[2], harmonize truly together: modern systems would have had neither.

This appears to me then the characteristic difference of the three systems; Romanism as well as Ultra-Protestantism would consult readily for man's

[1] Commination Service.

[2] Much instruction on the repentant character of our Liturgy, will be found in a Tract now being published, No. 86. "On the Indications of a Superintending Providence in the preservation of the Liturgy, and the changes which it has undergone."

feverish anxiety to be altogether at ease; our Church sets him in the way in which GOD's peace may descend upon him, but forestalls not His sentence. She has no second Baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce him altogether free from his past sins. There are but two periods of *absolute* cleansing, Baptism and the day of judgment. She therefore teaches him continually to repent, that so his sins *may be* blotted out, though she has no commission to tell him absolutely that they *are;* she repeats to him his LORD's words, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy-laden, and *I* will give you rest," and so sends him to her LORD, that he may "find rest for his soul," but does not anticipate His gracious act; she absolves him, "if he earnestly and heartily desire it," "by His authority committed unto" her, and then (even while holding out her most solemn form of Absolution, as a means of relieving the troubled conscience,) she confesses the incompleteness of her own act, in that she subjoins a prayer for pardon of those sins, from which she had just absolved him; "O most merciful God, who dost so put away the "sins of those who truly repent, that Thou remem- "berest them no more; Open Thine eye of mercy "upon this Thy servant, who most earnestly desireth "pardon and forgiveness; impute not unto him his "former sins." The very renewal of her Eucharistic absolution, "pardon and deliver you from *all* your sins," attests that she does not hold them to have been all absolutely remitted; but thus she sets him in a way

whereby he may obtain peace; she bids him repent, sorrow, sue for pardon, not forget his repentance, come to Him who can and will give rest, pronounces over him His Absolution, invites him where "his "sinful body may be made clean by His Body, and "his soul washed through His most precious Blood," blesses him with His blessing, "the Peace of God which passeth all understanding," and so dismisses him, bearing with him, as she hopes, His peace, Who alone is "the Author of Peace," Whose alone it is to bestow it. And this is altogether in accordance with Scripture, which uniformly speaks of "peace" as the *direct* gift of God. "Grace be unto "you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord "Jesus Christ," is the standing[1] Apostolic salutation to the Church; and thence is the Church's blessing[2], "The Peace of God which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds;" so again[3],

[1] It is used by St. Paul, with a very slight variation, in all his Epistles; in Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2; Col. i. 2; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 2; Phil. 3; "Grace be unto you and peace from God *our* Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ;" in Gal. i. 3. it is "from God *the* Father," &c.; in 1 Tim. i. 2. "Grace, mercy, and peace from God *our* Father;" 2 Tim. i. 2. "*the* Father;" Tit. i. 3. "the Lord Jesus Christ the Saviour:" St. Peter uses a similar salutation, 2 Pet. i. 2. "Grace and peace *be multiplied* unto you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord:" and St. John, writing to an individual, (2 Epist. 3.) the same as that of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, but adding "the Son of the Father in truth and love."

[2] Phil. iv. 7.

[3] 2 Thess. iii. 16.

"the Lord of peace give you peace always;" "My [1] peace I give unto you;" "the God [2] of hope fill you with all peace and joy in believing;" "The fruit [3] of the Spirit is love, joy, peace;" GOD is the "God of Peace," our LORD "is our peace [4]:" nor is peace spoken of any where as coming from any other source but directly from Him.

The difference then between the views in question is not, as to the hope of pardon to the penitent, not even as to the prospect of peace in this world; but as to what is penitence, and how that peace is to be obtained; whether from men's declarations, or directly from GOD; whether at first or at last whenever it pleases GOD to send it; whether amid forgetfulness of past sin, or while recalling it in bitterness of recollection and praying GOD for His Son's sake to pardon it; whether amid continual humiliation, which saith, "God be merciful to me a sinner," or amid exultation at being free from self-righteousness. As repentance is GOD's gift, and GOD's work in a man's soul, so is there obviously great danger in interfering with it; "He woundeth" and He must "heal;" He "killeth" and He must "make alive;" He "bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up." They must have had but little acquaintance with wounded consciences, who know not how terribly He does "chasten man for sin, making his beauty to consume away," how "He writeth bitter things

[1] John xiv. 27. [2] Rom. xv. 13. [3] Gal. v. 22. [4] Eph. ii. 14.

against him, and maketh him to possess his former iniquities;" and in this awfulness of His chastisements, which we very often cannot mitigate, though we would, He bids us beware how we interfere with His work in the soul, or apply lenitives, when He is probing the diseased and ulcerous part "to the very dividing of the soul and body." These false kindnesses, (which in one body of Christians, now daily parting more from the Church, is become systematic,) are continually marring the work, which GOD had with a healthful severity begun. The penitent, untimely delivered from his distress, loses the energy of repentance, and the hatred of sin, which GOD was annealing into his soul, and becomes a common-place and a sickly Christian. What I would urge then, is to hold out the prospect of peace, but as GOD's gift through the deepening of repentance; not to cut short His work, whether by the Sacrament of penance, or inward persuasions, or misapplied promises of the Gospel; but to direct to His mercies in CHRIST; and He, who "knoweth whereof we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust," will have pity on them, "as a father pitieth his own children," when they have learnt to "fear Him." Not peace, but salvation is our end; but peace also He, the GOD of peace, will bestow, as He sees most healthful for them, according to the evenness and consistency of their course; clouding it, if they are remiss or halting; renewing it, when they humble themselves and press onward; and in all cases bestowing upon us more than we deserve, for His sake "Who is our Peace."

Art. XXV. *On the Sacraments.*

On the Sacraments, two sets of charges are brought; one, that we unduly exalt the Sacraments of our LORD; the other, that we are not disinclined to ascribe a sacramental character to other rites which the Church of Rome has defined to be Sacraments in the same sense as Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. And these two charges have naturally gone together; for in the school of Calvin and Zuingli, the two great Sacraments have been so lowered, that they who have learned therein, would speak of them in language scarcely so high as we should of rites, which are not "Sacraments of the Gospel." We must then to them appear both to ascribe to these rites, the character of Sacraments, as they conceive of Sacraments, and to exalt the true Sacraments to something higher.

To speak first of that portion of that charge, which relates to Sacraments generally. The caution of our Church on this subject is very remarkable; she no where denies that there are more than two Sacraments, *in some sense of the word;* nay, in the Articles, Catechism, and Homilies alike, she implies or asserts that there are more; in the Articles she denies only that "those five commonly called Sacra-
"ments—are to be counted for *Sacraments of the*
"*Gospel*, being such as have grown partly of the
"corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are *states*
"*of life allowed in the Scriptures*, but *yet have not the*

"*like nature of Sacraments with Baptism* and the "Lord's Supper:" for in that she says, that they "have not the *like nature* of Sacraments" with the two great Sacraments, she rather implies that some of them have *some* sacramental character, though not "like" to those two. In like manner, when in her Catechism she teaches her children, that there are "two Sacraments, only, ordained by Christ in His "Church, generally, [*i. e.* universally,] necessary to "salvation," she implies that there are other rites which might have the name, though not of this high dignity, nor "universally necessary," nor "ordained by Christ Himself." And precisely this distinction is made in the Homilies, which recognize several "sacraments" in that larger sense, at the very time that, and in the same language as the Articles, they distinguish between them and the two great Sacraments. "As[1] "for the number of them [the Sacraments], if they "should be considered according to the *exact signi-* "*fication of a Sacrament*, namely for visible signs, ex- "pressly commanded in the New Testament, where- "unto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of "sins, and of our holiness *and joining in Christ*, there "be but two; namely Baptism and the Supper of "the Lord. For although Absolution hath the pro- "mise of forgiveness of sins, yet by the express word "of the New Testament, it hath not this promise "*annexed and tied to the visible sign*, which is imposi-

[1] Of Common Prayer and Sacraments.

" tion of hands. For this visible sign (I mean laying
" on of hands,) is not expressly commanded in the
" New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the
" visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper
" are; and therefore Absolution is *no such Sacrament*
" *as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are*, and though
" the ordering of ministers hath this visible sign and
" promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of
" sin, *as all other Sacraments besides the above named*
" *do*. Therefore neither it, *nor any other Sacrament*
" *else, be such Sacraments* as Baptism and the Com-
" munion are. But in a general acception, the name
" of a Sacrament may be attributed to any thing;
" whereby an holy thing is signified. In which un-
" derstanding of the word, the ancient writers have
" given this name not only to the other five, com-
" monly of late years taken and used for supplying
" the number of the seven Sacraments, but also to
" divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil,
" washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby
" to repute them as Sacraments, *in the same significa-*
" *tion* that the two fore-named Sacraments are. And
" therefore St. Augustine, weighing the true signifi-
" cation and *exact meaning* of the word, writing to
" Januarius, and also in the third book of Christian
" doctrine, affirmeth that the 'Sacraments of Chris-
" tians, as they are most excellent in signification, so
" are they most few in number;' and in both places
" maketh mention expressly of two, the Sacrament

" of Baptism and the Supper of the LORD. And " although there are retained by the order of the " Church of England, besides these two, certain " other rites and ceremonies about the institution of " ministers in the Church, Matrimony, Confirmation, " of children by examining them of their knowledge " of the articles of faith, and joining thereto the " prayers of the Church for them, and likewise for " the Visitation of the sick; yet no man ought to " take these for Sacraments, *in such signification and* " *meaning* as the Sacraments of Baptism and the " Lord's Supper are; but either for godly states of " life, necessary in Christ's Church, and therefore " worthy to be set forth by public action and so- " lemnity, by the ministry of the Church, or else " judged to be such ordinances, as may make for the " instruction, comfort, and edification, of Christ's " Church."

This passage is very remarkable for the principles which it contains, and the caution with which it is expressed; and that, the more, since the object of the writer, as well as of the Article, was to guard against an over-, rather than an under- value of these secondary Sacraments, or Sacramentals[1]: he had then

[1] The word " Sacramentals" is used by Beza, (quoted Hooker, E. P. IV. i. 4. ed. Keble) to designate " any ceremony importing signification of Spiritual things;" the introduction of any such into the Church of GOD, he declares to be a " right grievous sin ;" yet, remarkably enough, as Hooker observes, the title " as sacraments'

to protest against Romanist error, not against a profane indifference to sacred rites; and yet he not only altogether shrinks from denying that sacred rites may be termed "sacraments," but expressly calls them so, only laying down that they are "not *such* Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are," agreeing herein altogether with the Fathers. The modern school may apologize for, or elude the passage, but they clearly would not themselves have so written. (2) He does not even deny that some of those which are not, in the highest sense, "sacraments," have a spiritual gift conveyed in connexion with them. On the contrary, of Absolution he expressly says, that "it hath the promise of forgiveness of sins," only "not annexed to the visible sign," and is thereby distinguished from the great Sacraments. So, again, Orders he allows to have both "the visible sign and promise, *i. e.* of spiritual grace; but not "remission of sins," and thus it also is distinguished from the proper Sacraments. And this coincides with our Ordination Service; for the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," had been a manifest impiety, unless the act of Ordination were, to those worthily receiving it, accompanied with the gift of the Holy Spirit; as indeed it is expressly affirmed by Holy Scripture, that an *inward* "gift" was bestowed upon Timothy through his ordination, "Stir up the gift of God which is in

which Hooker adopts (l. c.) is used by the same writers, who entitle "the Apostles' imposition of hands" "a sign, or as it were sacrament."

"thee by the putting on of my hands, with the laying "on of the hands of the presbytery [1]." So further, he says in general of "other sacraments," that they "*all* lack the promise of remission of sins;" implying at the same time, that there are others, which he would call sacraments (as Matrimony is expressly termed in another homily [2]), and that what at once distinguished them from the great Sacraments was, that they conveyed no "remission of sins;" whereby he virtually allows that they did convey spiritual grace. And so, probably, he meant that such rites, as did not "grow of the corrupt following of the Apostles," (Art. XXV.) had such spiritual grace; nor indeed does it appear how a sacred action, which is really a type or image of a sacred thing (which is his definition) should be destitute of spiritual influences. Such is also the teaching of later Divines of chief note in the Church. Thus Hooker vindicates against the Puritans, the spiritual graces of Confirmation, with an appeal to the universal teaching of the ancient Church. "The Fathers every where impute unto "it that gift or grace of the Holy Ghost, not which "maketh us Christian men, but, when we are made "such, assisteth us in all virtue, armeth us against "temptation and sin."—"The Fathers therefore, being "thus persuaded, held confirmation as an ordinance

[1] 2 Tim. i. 6. 1 Tim. iv. 14.

[2] Sermon on Swearing, pt. i. See other authorities among later English Divines in Palmer on the Church, pt. 6. c. 8. t. 2. p. 442.

" Apostolic, *always profitable* in God's Church, al-
" though not always accompanied with equal large-
" ness of those external effects, which gave it coun-
" tenance at the first."—" By which answer [of St.
" Jerome] it appeareth that his opinion was, that
" the Holy Ghost is received in Baptism: that con-
" firmation is only a *sacramental complement*." " Now
" what effect their imposition of hands hath, either
" after Baptism administered by heretics, or other-
" wise, St. Jerome in that place hath made no men-
" tion, because all men understood that in converts
" it tendeth to the fruits of repentance, and craveth
" in behalf of the penitent such grace as David after
" his fall desired at the hands of God; in others, the
" fruit and benefit is that which hath been before
" shewn."—" Whereunto [to the fatherly encourage-
" ment and exhortation of the Bishops] imposition
" of hands and prayer being added, our warrant for
" the great good effect thereof is the same which
" Patriarchs, Prophets, Priests, Apostles, Fathers,
" and men of God, have had for such their particular
" invocations, and benedictions, as no man, I suppose,
" professing truth of religion will easily think to have
" been without fruit [1]."

Not less remarkable, on the other side, is the light which this comparison throws upon the views of the writer of the Homily, as to the two great Sacraments. He does not indeed rest the question of the number of proper sacraments, solely on the

[1] Eccl. Pol. V. 66. § 4. 6. 7.

external distinctions, but goes also to the good ground of Christian Antiquity; and asserts them to be distinct, because the Ancient Church ever so distinguished them. But besides this ground, he also, in the same way as the Articles and Catechism, alleges the peculiar dignity cast around the two proper Sacraments, in that in them nothing was left to be supplied by man; every thing in them was ordained by our LORD Himself; the visible sign, as well as the promise of the invisible grace, and the promised connexion between the two: so that although the one or other rite come near to have the character of a Sacrament, yet it falls short in that it is not equally guarded. Thus he points out that Absolution "hath the promise of forgiveness of sins," but not the connexion with the visible sign; Ordination hath *a* promise and the visible sign, but not *the promise* which the others have. And this distinctive promise is, union with our LORD, and consequent justification and sanctification; for so he expressly says, the "*exact*" definition of a sacrament is a visible sign, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is "*annexed* the promise of *forgiveness* of our sins and of our *holiness* and *joining in Christ*." Other rites may be and are means of grace, but no other than the Sacraments of our LORD are means of direct union with Him. And this union, justification, sanctification, are, according to this clear and distinct writer, not merely concomitants, accompanying the right use of the Sacrament, but they are (he uses the very

phrase to which the Ultra-Protestant theories from his day to our's most object) "*annexed and tied to the visible sign;*" for the absence of such annexation he alleges as the ground why Absolution is not to be regarded as a Sacrament; again, coinciding with the language of the Catechism, that they are the means, "whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace;" they are not only pledges to assure our faith; much less *mere* outward signs of what is worked inwardly, but means and channels whereby God conveys it.

Thus then this passage of the Homily conveys throughout precisely the view as to the distinction between the true, proper Sacraments, and those rites which in some respects approximate to Sacraments, and the grounds of that distinction, which are now stigmatized as Papistical. I need only adduce one passage, in which this distinction has of late been very clearly stated [1].

"If justification be the inward application of the "Atonement, we are furnished at once with a suffi- "cient definition of a sacrament for the use of our "Church. The Romanist considers that there are "seven; we do not strictly determine the number. "We define the word generally to be an 'outward "sign of an inward grace,' without saying to how "many ordinances this applies. However, what we "do determine is, that Christ has ordained two spe- "cial Sacraments, as *generally necessary to salvation.*

[1] Newman on Justification, Lect. 6. "On the gift of Righteousness," v. fin. p. 169, 70.

" This, then, is the characteristic mark of those two, " separating them from all other whatever; and what " is this but saying in other words, that they are the " only *justifying* rites, or instruments of communi- " cating the atonement, which *is* the one thing " necessary to us? Ordination, for instance, gives " *power*, yet without making the soul acceptable to " God; Confirmation gives light and strength, yet is " the mere completion of Baptism; and Absolution " is a negative ordinance, removing the barrier which " sin has raised between us and that grace, which by " inheritance is our's. But the two Sacraments 'of " the Gospel,' are the instruments of inward life, " according to our Lord's declaration, that Baptism " is a new *birth*, and that in the Eucharist we eat the " *living* Bread."

Now this distinction, which, with the Homily, we have made, the Romanist will not make; for it would be conceding the whole question, were he to allow that two of his seven Sacraments were completely *sui generis*, so as wholly to be above, and removed from, the other five. The rest would be a question of words and names only. On the contrary, the Council of Trent, where it anathematizes any who should say, that, " these[1] seven Sacraments " are in such wise equal among themselves, that one " is in no respect superior to the other," meant, as Card. Bellarmine[2] explains it, to condemn those

[1] Sess. 7. can. 3.

[2] De Sacram. L. 2. c. 28.

who ascribe to Baptism the same dignity as the Eucharist; and he is very indignant with those impugners of the Council, who said that they observed this Canon, in that they did separate Baptism and the Eucharist from the rest, regarding the former as the institutions of CHRIST, the rest, as the inventions of men. "This," he says, "is to blink the question," for that first, the Council assumed that all seven are Sacraments of the New Law; secondly, that the object was to condemn a further error of the Lutherans, who regarded Baptism as of equal dignity with the Eucharist; thirdly, "the Council itself asserted the "Eucharist to excel all the other Sacraments[1], but "did not make this comparison as to the others." Further it is part of the Romanist system to inculcate that each of their Sacraments has not only something peculiar, but some superiority over the rest; that so there should result a sort of balance of dignity between them, and none, except the Eucharist, should be placed above the rest, so as to introduce any essential or practical disparity between them. And thus they guard their number seven: since though they cannot but admit that Baptism has some especial prerogatives over other of their Sacraments, so, they contend, have others; so that this is to be no sufficient ground for distinguishing them. Thus Card. Bellarmine alleges, that "Baptism[2] excels "as to the effect of remitting sin, in that it

[1] Sess. 12. cap. 3. [2] L. c.

" remits original sin, and actual sins with all the " punishment due to them, which other Sacraments " do not; Confirmation excels as to the effect of grace " toward good-doing, for it presupposes the effect of " Baptism, and superadds more abundant grace; the " Eucharist excels all, as to the substance of the " Sacrament—as having not only an operative power, " but containing truly Christ Himself, the Author of " that power; Penance excels all in necessity, except " Baptism, with which it has this excellence in com- " mon; Extreme Unction in a manner excels Penance, " as to the effect of grace, like as Confirmation " excels Baptism, for it presupposes the whole effect " of Penance, and adds more abundant grace, which " can not only wipe away all sins, if present, but " remove the very traces of sin; Orders excels all, " except Confirmation, as to the minister, in that it " can be conferred by a Bishop only; nay, herein " it seems to excel Confirmation; since Confirmation, " sometimes by dispensation, may be conferred by a " mere priest—also it excels the rest, in that it places " man in a higher grade than other Christians; " lastly, Matrimony excels in signification; for it " signifies the union of Christ with the Church, " whence it is called by the Apostle a 'great Sacra- " ment.'" No one can fail to see the object of these ingenious and fine-drawn distinctions, (which were held generally in the council of Trent itself[1],) nor

[1] " All agree that if you regard the necessity and utility of the " Sacraments, Baptism ought to have the preference; but Mar-

how presumptuously and wantonly Rome sacrifices the intrinsic greatness of one at least of the two great sacraments; nor the total difference of character between her distinctions, and those of the Homily and ourselves.

So then, this distinction between the "proper "Sacraments" and "offices of the Church, to which "there is allied a Sacramental efficacy," so far from being one connected with Romanism, was of old adopted in our Church against Romanism; and when Romanists would distinguish between the efficacy of *their* Sacraments, they do it altogether in a different way; for a different end; and assuming that they are all in one respect equal, as being all "*proper "Sacraments.*"

Baptism.

A late Lutheran writer[1] admits that "as to the "Sacrament of Baptism there is no controversy of "much moment between the two Churches" [Lutheran and Romish]. It is then hardly worth while to enter into the question, what the Romish Church means by the "Character" impressed upon the baptized, and whether this may have a sound sense or no. There remains, of course, one great difference between the two Churches, not peculiar to Baptism, but affecting

"riage, if you regard what it signifies; Confirmation, if you look "to the dignity of the minister; and the Eucharist, if to the "veneration due to it." P. Sarpi, l. ii. c. 85.

[1] Marheineke Institt. Symbol. § 36.

much men's comfort and security, in receiving either Sacrament, that the "intention of the Priest to do what the Church does," is, according to Rome, requisite to make the Sacrament valid. A well-known instance in the late history of France of one who confessed on his death-bed, that he for years administered the Sacraments, meaning expressly "*not* to do what the Church did," illustrates at once the danger of such definitions, and the insecurity which this tenet, secured as it is by an anathema, must cast over those of the Romish Communion, whether they have indeed the Sacraments or no. "If any one say," are the words of Catharin, Bp. of Minori, in the Council of Trent[1], "that these cases [of meaning to make the

1 "Sarpi, Hist. du Concile de Trente, l. ii. c. 86. He was arguing that "the intention of the minister" required by the Council of Florence for the validity of a Sacrament, should be restrained to the "outward intention, whatever the inward purpose of the officiator might be;" in other words, that all which should be necessary to the validity of a Sacrament on the part of the Priest, should be an outward conformity with the rites of the Church. He urged, "supposing an internal intention necessary, then, if a "Priest having the care of four or five thousand souls should be "an unbeliever yet a great hypocrite, who, whether in the Bap-"tism of infants, or the absolution of penitents, or the consecra-"tion of the Eucharist, had the intention of not doing what the "Church does, then it must be said that all the children were "damned, the penitents unabsolved, and that none of the com-"municants had derived any benefit." "He insisted much," continues the historian, "on the affliction which an affectionate father "would feel, if, seeing his child dying, he doubted the intention "of the Priest who had baptized it; or, the disquiet of one who

" administration of the Sacraments a jest] are rare, " would to God that in this corrupt age there were " not reason to think that they are very frequent!" The very belief that there was a power to invalidate the Sacraments would be used by Satan as a temptation to make men essay to do so. Ultra-Protestants, strangely enough, come round to the same result of casting uncertainty on the efficacy of Baptism, in that they make it, in infants, to depend upon the faith of the parents, sponsors, congregation, or *Ministers*, not on " CHRIST's institution and promises, although they be ministered by evil men." Art. XXVI. And whereas they would call it " popish " to believe that an infant is, through the faith of the Church, which

" received Baptism in an imperfect frame of mind, should he have " reason to suspect that the Priest who had baptized him, was a " false Christian, and that instead of intending to baptize or to " confess him, or to give him the Eucharist, he had meant only " to wash him in jest, and to make a sport of all the rest," on which follow the terrible words quoted in the text. The decree of the Council finally was, " if any one say that in ministers, when " they make and confer the Sacraments, there is not required at " least the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be " anathema." Courayer says, that the mode in which Catharin explained the Council of Florence, was insensibly adopted in the schools as the explanation of that of Trent, though opposed in the Council itself, and though the Council seemed to require an internal intention on the part of the Minister. As far as it is adopted, it is a manifest evasion of the decree, " on account," as Courayer says, " of the inconvenience resulting from its obvious sense."

brings it unto CHRIST, accepted by Him, and regenerated by His Spirit, whatever be the character of the immediate human agents, they themselves coincide with the Romish error just stated [1]. The principle of St. Augustine, on the contrary, that children being able to put no bar of an opposite will, GOD's goodness flows unrestrained towards them, is, in our own Church, thus beautifully expressed by Hooker [2]; "He which with imposition of hands and prayer did "so great works of mercy for restoration of bodily "health, was worthily judged as able to effect the "infusion of heavenly grace into them whose age "was not yet depraved with that malice which might

[1] "Why leave two or three expressions in the Baptismal Ser- "vice and her Catechism, so unguarded by explanation, as to "induce many to imagine that every child is really regenerated "in that ordinance, and made a true and living member of Christ, "by a certain form of words, however, and *by whomsoever* (being "a priest) pronounced, and even in spite of the unbelief or care- "lessness of all the parties concerned."—Essays on the Church, p. 269. Another ushers in, with an apology, a hypothetic case of a foxhunting clergyman, in illustration of the same point, (Fraser, p. 18). So with regard to the other Sacrament, it is used as part of an argument *ex absurdo;* "in infidel and debased "Spain and Italy, our Lord's Body and Blood is constantly offered "to the people, inasmuch as the priests who there officiate—*unbe-* "*lievers as most of them* are—are yet the right line of Apostolic "succession!"—Essays, p. 312. Yet what has the unbelief of the Priest to do with the privileges of the people? "does their unbelief make void the righteousness of God?"

[2] Eccl. Pol. V. 66. 1. ed. Keble.

" be supposed a bar to the goodness of God towards " them. They brought Him therefore young children " to put his hands upon them and pray."

In the same way again Archbishop Bramhall[1]: " Secondly, we distinguish between the visible sign, " and the invisible grace; between the external sacra- " mental ablution, and the grace of the Sacrament, " that is, interior regeneration. We believe that " whosoever hath the former, hath the latter also, *so* " *that he do not put a bar against the efficacy of the* " *Sacrament by his infidelity or hypocrisy, of which a* " *child is not capable*, and therefore our very Liturgy " doth teach that a child baptized, dying before the " commission of actual sin, is undoubtedly saved." And more recently, Waterland[2]: " The second is " the case of infants. Their innocence and incapacity " are to them instead of repentance, which they do " not need, and of actual faith, which they cannot " have. They are capable of being savingly born of " water and the Spirit, and of being adopted into " sonship with what depends thereupon; *because* " *though they bring no virtues with them, no positive* " *righteousness, yet they bring no obstacle, no impedi-* " *ment.*"

The modern school, which denies as " Popish" this

[1] Of persons dying without Baptism, Works, p. 979, quoted in Tracts, No. 76. Catena Patrum, No. 2. " Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration," p. 20.

[2] On Regeneration, 2, quoted ib. p. 46.

doctrine (and it is upon it that the question of the baptismal regeneration of all infants in fact turns), have apparently yet to learn that Christian Baptism is not that of the servant, but of the LORD; that in the language of the Ancient Church "it is not man, but Christ, who baptizeth."

The chief charge against Rome as to the Sacrament of Baptism is, not that she has unduly exalted it, but, on the very contrary, that she has depreciated it. She insists indeed on its necessity, and there leaves it. This is the very coldest way, in which it could have been spoken of; she enlarges not on the gifts bestowed through it, on the Presence of our LORD thereat; on His communicating Himself to the soul, or His applying His own most precious Blood, thereby; or on the sacred Presence of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and His thenceforth making the baptized His temple unless He be grieved away. These blessed truths she rather casts into the shade, though she would not deny them: in her anxiety to secure a *peculiar* Presence of our LORD in the Holy Eucharist, she rather conceals, and is unwilling to dwell on, His Sacred Presence in this Sacrament, whereby He makes us members of Himself: in her wish to vindicate the equality and dignity of her other Sacraments, as Sacraments, she is obliged to disguise that which constitutes the peculiar greatness of the two proper Sacraments,—the union with and Presence of our LORD,—and vindicates it to one only in a carnal way. The dignity also

which she ascribes to her Sacraments of Confirmation and Penance, leads her members the more away from looking to their Baptism: for Confirmation presupposes, as Bellarmine says, the gifts of Baptism, and adds more abundant grace, and so, "excels it as to the effect of grace for good-doing;" and when one sins among them, he is to look, not to GOD's mercies in Christ pledged to him in Baptism, and all the undefined and overflowing favour and loving-kindness involved in being made a member of the ever-Blessed Son, but to a distinct Sacrament of Penance. Thus, in both ways, her members are taught to look upon Baptism as a mere preliminary act, in the back-ground as it were, of the Christian life; the fore-ground, upon which their eye is fixed, being taken up by their Sacrament of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. It is, indeed, a remarkable instance of the effect of her whole system, even upon parts where she has not introduced error: it illustrates also mournfully the cancerous nature of error in any portion of revealed truth, how it spreads and preys upon the parts yet sound. As to Holy Baptism, Rome innovated not, and yet she has doubly lowered it; by a carnal glory which she would shed around the Holy Eucharist, and by the obstinacy, wherewith she would maintain the number of her seven Sacraments, and the human theories she had to resort to in order to uphold them. This indeed was the charge, brought by our early Controversialists against Rome,—that she depreciated the Sacrament of Baptism, to make way for her theory

respecting that of the Holy Eucharist; and so *they* would remedy her error on the latter, not in the modern way, by lowering both Sacraments, but by showing that Baptism had the same glorious privileges belonging to it, on which Rome would build up its carnal explanation of our LORD's presence in the Holy Eucharist. Thus Bp. Jewell[1], "*Are we not par-* " *takers of the same Divine Substance in the Sacrament* " *of Baptism?* St. Augustine saith, 'By Baptism " we are incorporate into Christ, and are made one " Body with His Body.' Leo saith, 'The Body of " him that is new born in Baptism, is made the flesh " of Christ crucified,' that is to say, 'Flesh of His " Flesh, and Bone of His Bone.' Yet nevertheless, " the very substance of water remaineth still. Even " so, notwithstanding we be made partakers of the " Divine Substance of Christ, in the receiving of the " holy Mysteries, yet the substance of bread therein " remaineth still. And forasmuch as ye would prove " by these words of St. Ambrose, that Christ is pre- " sent in the Sacraments, the same St. Ambrose also " saith, that Christ is *likewise present in the* water " of Baptism. Thus he saith, &c." And in another place he explicitly brings this charge against the Romanists, "Forasmuch[2] as these two Sacra- " ments being both of force alike, these men [the

[1] Defence of Apologie, p. 22. See also Replie to Harding, 285, and further references in "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism," p. 179. sqq. ed. 1.

[2] Reply, p. 249, 50. quoted more at length. Ibid.

" Romanists] to advance their fantasies in the one, " by comparison so much abase the other, I think " it good, briefly and by the way, somewhat to touch " what the old Catholic Fathers have written of " God's invisible workings in the Sacrament of Bap- " tism. The Fathers in the Council of Nice say " thus:"

So then this school, while they think they have been opposing Romanist tendencies, have abandoned the strongest argument against them, and the most likely to recover them from their errors as to the Holy Eucharist.

But although in reality Rome has not, as to this Sacrament, admitted any positive statement, (at least none of any greater moment,) un-Catholic and un-Primitive, great and main points there are in the doctrine of Baptism, which by those who have followed an "extreme reformation," have ever been accounted part of the corruptions of Popery. It was one of the objections of the Non-Conformists to our Liturgy, at the Savoy-Conference, and held to be "sinful," that the Minister was "obliged to pronounce all baptized infants regenerate;" and modern Dissenters continue the charge [1]. Those, however, in our Church, who in this and other doctrinal points, have followed the teaching of the Non-Conformists, (since they cannot, as Ministers of the Church, blame the Liturgy,) throw the blame upon those who understand

[1] See Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, p. 176, ed. 1.

it as the Non-Conformists out of the Church, and the Bishops within it, at that time equally did. It is, indeed, not one of the least strange phenomena of the day, that a truth should be by newspapers and periodicals branded in members of the Church as a modern "heresy," which eighty years past, it is acknowledged, was held by almost every minister of the Church [1], which is still held probably, at all events by all her Bishops; nay, that it should have been (until of late when the field has been widened) denominated as "*the* Oxford heresy," and placed as the head and front of our offending.

I own, my Lord, I have myself shrunk from stating fully the degree of evidence which there is, that Baptismal regeneration is the doctrine of the Church of England, lest in these days, when men hold so laxly by their Church, and are ready to quit her upon any ground of difference,—ready to suspect her, and very slow to suspect themselves,—the result of proving that Baptismal regeneration is the doctrine of our Church, would be that men would rather forsake their Church than embrace her doctrine. It seems to be looked upon as a first principle, that the duty of a Minister is to preach what he thinks the Gospel any how; and so if one discovers that he cannot consistently preach in the Church, he forthwith increases some old schism, or forms a new one instead

[1] "Romaine states, that among the whole of the clergy, about 10,000 in number, of his time, there were not seven that preached the Gospel of Christ."—Travels in Town, t. ii. p. 105.

of remaining still, until he should see his way more clearly. Our schisms already threaten to make us a bye-word and a reproach, throughout the whole world; we carry our disgrace with us wherever we go; and are in danger of becoming a plague-spot to the Christian name, instead of being (as we might have been) one of the largest Communions, and the most flourishing of all collective Churches. The English nation is in the way to become the very type of schism. Rent as we are, I would not willingly contribute to make the rent worse. Those who wish to pursue the subject calmly, might be amply satisfied by the very clear and full statement in the valuable work of Bp. Bethell[1]; for myself, I had rather continue to be termed "heretic" by those who know me not, than give occasion to any to become a "schismatic." It was the fault of the Church, in the last century, or rather of those who had the mastery over the Church, that her Ministers, by preaching her doctrines negatively or coldly, gave occasion to many whose spirit GOD had stirred, to seek instruction rather in the writings of those not of her Communion—the old Non-Conformists—than within herself. They were reproached in their day, as their successors now in turn reproach those who would build up the ancient doctrine. Their forefathers' was the happier lot. As however it has been sown, so must we reap; the true leaven will, we hope, in time

[1] General View of the Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, c. 6. ed. 2.

leaven the whole lump, not by expelling any particles of it, but by converting them into itself; Moses' rod will swallow up the rest; meanwhile, while it is our duty to teach our own people that sound doctrine, one would rather endeavour to gain access in some other way to those whom we are not obliged to instruct, and not, upon a topic on which they are least inclined to be patient, urge upon them the words of a mother, whom they reverence not enough to obey against their own views, and whom possibly they might forsake. Others may do it, who could do it with less invidiousness. Not as if I entertained any doubt, my Lord, that we speak with our Church in this point, and that every syllable of her teaching in her services for Baptism, Confirmation, and the Catechism goes the same way; and that her Articles imply the same; (many who held otherwise, have seen this, when they came to study their Church's services dispassionately;) but that it seems useless and ungracious for us to press upon them, that their Church holds the doctrine, until their prejudices against it shall first be, as those of many are being, somewhat softened. And then the teaching of their Church will be plain to them. We would wish to gain, not to exasperate them. And in turn we might perhaps claim so much courtesy that the name of "heretic" or "heresy" should not be so freely used of doctrines, which, themselves confess, certain expressions [1] in the services of the Church

[1] See above, p. 112. "This one ordinance, Baptism, is made with many the point on which every thing turns. This probably

seem at first sight to favour. It seems hard measure to bestow on us the title "heretic" for taking literally those words of our Church, which they defend by supposing them to be spoken "in the judgment of charity," thereby allowing that our's is the plain and grammatical meaning, only that on other grounds it is to be taken with some allowance. And this courtesy we would claim rather for their own sakes than for our's.

And to this reconciliation it may perhaps the rather tend, if I add that we do not wish to enforce any technical view of Baptismal regeneration: for myself, I should be fully content with any view, which acknowledged in the simple sense the words which our Church teaches every child to say of itself, "wherein "I was made a child of God, a member of Christ, and "an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven;" (meaning of course, really what is there said, a real child of GOD, and a real member of CHRIST, not *simply* an "outward member of an outward body of people "called Christians.") The same truth may be variously viewed; contemplated on different sides; nay, it must be according to our moral character, differently appreciated; and so it may be that persons holding different language may in fact be expressing different parts of the same truth, and speaking of it in different relations, but still hold it. The Western

arises from a feeling that their main strength lies in this direction. We admit that the Church is more open to misconstruction on this point than on most others."—Fraser, p. 16.

Church after St. Augustine, *chiefly* spoke of the blessings of Baptism as the remission of sins; the Eastern as the introduction of a new principle of life; but both as flowing from our engraffing into CHRIST. To us, engraffing into, or being made a member of CHRIST, appears the fullest, as it is the most exalted expression of that doctrine, and yet in harmony also with what we see of the corruption of the actual Christian world, in that, though all have been made branches of the true Vine once, they only, which bear fruit, abide in CHRIST; the rest are "cast forth as a branch and withered." Yet though we would be thankful to be made the instruments of raising men's sense of the privileges of their Baptism, and cannot but see that, when it was held in its fulness, it cast a reality over other doctrine, and was a high spring to Christian action, we wish not to restrain the liberty of others. There is unquestionably in Christian Antiquity a tone about this and other connected truths, with which our present language and feelings and habits stand in melancholy contrast; but the whole must rise together; a higher doctrine of the Sacraments will increase men's sense of their Christian responsibilities; and more elevated Christian action (and by GOD'S mercy Christian action is rising, we trust, towards a higher standard amongst us,) will fit men to receive higher notions of the Sacraments, and enable them to hold them safely. But to this there are many approximations; and those who are sensible of their own infirmities, will hail every approximation with joy, not measur-

ing rigidly how far it seems from their ideal, but rejoicing that, with themselves, it is approaching to it.

As tending to this end of peace, which your Lordship would so gladly promote, I may be permitted to adduce a statement by another hand, in which the writer assigns the bounds, within which Baptismal regeneration has been held by the chief Divines of our later Church, and separates off other questions in themselves important, yet still not essentially affecting the main question. In these detached questions many will find that their difficulties lie; and although a man's views of Baptismal regeneration will be affected by the way in which he settles these questions, yet are different views on them consistent with holding the main doctrine, and some may perhaps thereby be enabled to employ the Liturgy of their Church more literally than they at present do. It will happen also not unseldom on these points also, that people using nearly the same language, employ it in a lower or higher sense; as, one by admission into the Christian covenant will understand only an outward, another a mystical, though undefined, change of condition.

The writer then thus explains wherein he conceives the great body of our Divines to be agreed as to this doctrine, and what may be termed open questions among them.

"By[1] this doctrine is meant, first, that the Sa-

[1] Preface to Catena Patrum, No. 2. (Tracts, No. 76.) "Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration."

" crament of Baptism is not a mere *sign* or *promise*,
" but actually a *means* of grace, an *instrument* by
" which, when rightly received, the soul is admitted
" to the benefits of CHRIST'S atonement, such as the
" forgiveness of sin, original and actual, reconcilia-
" tion to God, a new nature, adoption, citizenship in
" Christ's kingdom, and the inheritance of heaven,—
" in a word, Regeneration. And next, Baptism is
" considered to be rightly received, when there is no
" positive obstacle or hindrance to the reception in
" the recipient, such as impenitence or unbelief
" would be in the case of an adult; so that infants
" are necessarily right recipients of it, as not being
" yet capable of actual sin [1].

" There is a variety of questions connected with
" the subject beyond the two positions above set
" down, on which the writers under review differ
" more or less from each other, but not so as in the
" slightest degree to interfere with their clear and
" deliberate maintenance of these. Such, for in-
" stance, as the following:—Whether grace be given
" in and through the water, or only contempora-
" neously with it. Again, whether Baptism, strictly
" speaking, *conveys* the blessings annexed to it, or
" simply *admits* into a state gifted with those bless-
" ings, as being the initiatory rite of the covenant of
" mercy. Or, again, whether or not Baptism, be-
" sides washing away past sin, admits into a state in
" which, for sins henceforth committed, Repentance
" stands in place of a Sacrament, so as to ensure

[1] See above, p. 112, 113.

" forgiveness without specific ordinance; or whether " the Holy Eucharist is that ordinance; or whether " the full and explicit absolution of sin after Baptism " is altogether put off till the day of judgment. Or, " again, there may be difference of opinion as to " the state of infants dying unbaptized. Or, again, " whether Regeneration is an instantaneous work " completed in Baptism, or admits of degrees and " growth. Or, again, whether or not the Holy Spirit " can utterly desert a soul once inhabited by Him, " except to quit it for ever. Or, whether the change " in the soul made by Baptism is indelible, for good " or for evil; or may be undone, as if it had never " been. Or, how far the enjoyment of the grace " attached to it is suspended on the condition of our " doing our part in the covenant. All these are " questions, far from unimportant, but which do not " at present come into consideration; the one point, " maintained in the following extracts, being, that " infants are by and at Baptism unconditionally " translated from a state of wrath into a state of " grace and acceptance for Christ's sake."

Art. XXVIII. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

On the other great Sacrament, the distinction between the doctrine of our Church, and that of Rome on the one hand, and Ultra-Protestantism on the other, is in reality so broad and distinct, that there is the less difficulty. Nor is it, like Baptismal rege-

neration, the point of divergence of two systems; and so it may be considered with less view to its consequences as to other portions of truth. And one result of this has been, that many who, from being entangled in a modern system, have parted more or less from our Church's teaching upon Baptism, hold much higher and truer views of this Sacrament. Then also, as recurring in their actual Christian life, they could the less look upon it in an abstract way, or as a theory; their devotion and love for their Redeemer has sustained their doctrinal views; and the teaching of their Church has found a more ready entrance, when received apart from controversy, amid the most solemn part of the devotions of the Christian man. This teaching, which we receive in its plain sense, contains, we are persuaded, the full Catholic truth; we wish neither to add to it, nor to take from it. I would state it in connexion with, or in the words of our Formularies. It is, that the "Body and Blood of Christ are *verily* and indeed "taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's "Supper[1];" that they are conveyed by means of the elements, in that the article[2] says that "the Body of "Christ is *given*, taken, and eaten in the Supper, "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner;" for the word "given," as opposed to "taken and received," implies as has been remarked[3], that It accompa-

[1] Church Catechism. [2] Art. XXVIII.

[3] Knox on the use and import of the Eucharistic Symbols. Remains, t. i. p. 170.

nies in some mysterious way, the distribution of the elements, in that It is "given" by the Priest, and "taken and received" by the Communicants; and another article[1] says that the Sacraments "are *effectual* "signs of grace *by* the which He doth work invisibly "in us." Further, we really, though "spiritually eat "the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood[2];" and, as the fruit of this, "we dwell in Christ and Christ in "us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us;" and of this real indwelling the further fruit, as the Homily[3] said, is our justification and sanctification, "that our sinful[4] bodies are made clean by His Body, "and our Souls washed through His most precious "Blood;" and a continued fitness for Him to dwell therein, "that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us:" further, we do not simply "feed on," as if it were an act of *our* faith *only*, but we are by God *fed* "with[5] the Spiritual food of the most precious

[1] Only one out of *nine* "Reformed" Confessions, *i. e.* such as express the Zuingli-Calvinist doctrines as to the Sacraments, has the word "efficacia," *effectual*, and that one in a different sense; and *two* only use the word "through," or "by," and they explain it away. See Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, note L, p. 238. ed. 1.

[2] Exhortation at the Communion.

[3] The homily defined this to be the characteristic of the true Sacraments. See above, p. 98. sqq.

[4] Prayer just before the Consecration.

[5] "We most heartily thank Thee, for that *Thou* dost vouchsafe to *feed* us, who have duly received these holy Mysteries, with," &c.—Thanksgiving after the Communion.

" Body and Blood of His dear Son," yea "He[1] hath " given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ to be our " Spiritual food and sustenance *in* that holy Sacra- " ment;" and if we join hereto the lesson which one of the writers of the homilies bids us "take[2] of Emis- " senus, a godly father, when we go up to the reve- " rend communion, to be satisfied with Spiritual " meats, we look up with faith upon the holy Body and " Blood of our God; we marvel with reverence; *we* " *touch it with our mind;* we receive it with the hand " of our heart; we take it fully with our inward man."

On this combined teaching of our Articles, Catechism and Liturgy, we believe the doctrine of our Church to be, that in the Communion, there is a true, real[3], actual, though Spiritual, (or rather the more real, because Spiritual) Communication of the Body and Blood of Christ to the believer through the Holy Elements; that there is a true, real, spiritual, Presence of Christ at the Holy Supper; more real than if we could, with Thomas, feel Him with our hands, or thrust our hands into His side; that this is bestowed upon faith, and received by faith, as is every other Spiritual gift, but that our faith is but a receiver of God's real, mysterious, precious, Gift; that faith opens our eyes to see what is really there, and our hearts to receive it; but that It is there independently of our faith.

[1] Exhortation.

[2] First part of homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, end.

[3] "Verily and indeed."—Church Catechism.

And this real, spiritual Presence it is, which makes it so awful a thing to approach unworthily. It is the Presence of the Holy Ghost within us, imparted by Baptism, and hallowing our bodies as His temple, which makes the profanation of the bodies of the baptized so terrible a sin; it is "the dignity of that holy *Mystery*" which causes "the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof;" its being "a Divine thing to those who receive It worthily," which makes It "so dangerous to them that will presume to receive It unworthily." On no theory, whereby the sacred elements should be *mere* representations, or signs, or pledges, or tokens, of an absent thing, or means to kindle our faith, would the unworthy reception of the Holy Eucharist be so much more dreadful, than profane conduct in Church, where also CHRIST is "in the midst of" us. All which Scripture says of this case, "not discerning the Lord's Body," "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord," implies an immediate, unseen, Presence of that Body, which the wicked discern not, cannot partake of, but offend against, and so, "eat and drink judgment to themselves" in "that they eat and drink the Sacrament of so great a thing."

We do not then yield to the Romanists, as to the greatness of our privileges; we do not think that our LORD is less really and spiritually present than they; that He communicates Himself less by His Sacraments than they; that we less receive His Body and Blood, that our sinful bodies are less cleansed by His

glorious Body: that it is less "the[1] salve of immor-
" tality and sovereign preservative against death; a
" deifical communion; the sweet dainties of our Sa-
" viour; the pledge of eternal health; the defence of
" faith; the hope of the Resurrection; the food of
" immortality; the healthful grace; the conservatory
" to everlasting life;" we do not believe "This is My Body" less than they; we blame them, not as exceeding as to the greatness of the spiritual gift contained in that Sacrament (all human language and thoughts must fall short,) but for their carnal conceptions of it; for attempting to explain to man's senses the *mode* of his SAVIOUR'S Presence; for trying to solve the apparent contradiction that the elements are still what they were, but are, over and above, *to us* the Body and Blood of our LORD; for longing, with the weak faith of Nicodemus, to know the *how* of things Divine and Spiritual, and so for debasing them, and by their explanations leading, at least their Priesthood, to pride, and then to unbelief.

We would not then, my Lord, insist upon words,

[1] "Sayings of the Fathers, quoted in the 1st part of the
" homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the
" Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," as "sayings of
" godly men," "the ancient Catholic Fathers," "truly attributed
" to this celestial banquet and feast," of which it says, together with some of Holy Scripture, "if we would often call to mind,
" O how would they influence our hearts to desire the partici-
" pation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this
" bread, continually to thirst for this food."

if others will acknowledge the realities; we are content ourselves to receive the words "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee," &c. as they were used in the ancient Church from which our own preserved and restored them, not as denoting something absent, but as implying the spiritual unseen Presence of that Blessed Body and Blood, conveyed to us through the unchanged though consecrated elements, unchanged in material substance, changed in their use, their efficacy, their dignity, mystically and spiritually. We see not why we need avoid language used by the Fathers, as well as by the ancient Liturgies, and quoted with approbation by great Divines of our Church, that "the bread and wine is made the Body and Blood of Christ [1]," seeing that its being spiritually the Body and Blood of CHRIST, interferes not with its being still corporeally what the Apostle calls it, "the bread and wine," nor with the nature of a Sacrament, but rather the better

[1] "To whom Christ hath imparted power both over that mys-
"tical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural
"which is Himself, for the knitting of both in one; a work,
"which Antiquity doth call the making of Christ's Body."—
Hooker, E. P. V. lxxvii. 2. ed. Keble. "We are not ignorant
"that the ancient Fathers generally teach, that the bread and
"wine in the Eucharist by and upon the consecration of them do
"become, and *are made the Body* and Blood of Christ. But we
"know also, that though they do not all explain themselves the
"same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very dissonant
"from the doctrine of transubstantiation." Bp. Bull, Corruptions of the Church of Rome, iii. 2. Works, t. ii. p. 255. ed. Burton.

agrees thereto. We would not insist on these words; only we fear that when men object to them they object not to the words but to the realities, not to the terms, but to the truth they convey.

For deeply as Rome has erred, and much error as she has thereby given occasion to in others, we fear that others have erred still more deeply. Not Zuingli alone, but Calvin, have, in their way, so explained the mode of Christ's presence, as virtually to explain it away. With the fear of a weak faith, that would fain guard in a way of their own against man's giving God's glory to the outward elements, they transferred the presence of Christ *simply* to the believer's soul, and thus, on their side, destroyed "the nature of a Sacrament," depriving it of its inward fulness, as the Romanists, by the doctrine of Transubstantiation, had removed the outward sign. Their theory can hardly be better characterized than by words used by one of a very different school from ourselves, that "the faith of the believer" is not only (which all acknowledge, and as our Article states,) "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is "received and eaten in the Supper," but, is "the true "*consecrating* principle — that which brings down "Christ to the heart of each individual." The Zuingli-Calvinist theory, however it might disguise itself, (often from itself) in words, came to this; that the outward elements were not channels or instruments of grace, but that their only office was to kindle the faith of the individual, to set Christ

before his eyes, that so he might in mind ascend into heaven, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, feed on Him there by faith, appropriate His merits, and thereby become united with Him. And these things they often speak of eloquently, but the Sacraments themselves had no more share in even this elevation of the Christian's soul, than the hearing of God's word, upon which, according to them, their efficacy depended.

We would maintain then, my Lord, that here also our Church holds the Catholic truth distinct from the modern novelties, whether of Rome, or Zurich, or Geneva; that she holds a real, spiritual, presence of our LORD in the Holy Eucharist, that He really and truly therein and thereby imparts Himself, His Body, and His Blood, to the believer; and that through this gift bestowed by Him, and received through faith, Christ dwelleth in us and we in Him: we maintain, on the other side, that Rome has grievously erred by explaining in a carnal way the mode of this Presence, and requiring this her carnal exposition to be received as an article of Faith. She anathematizes[1] us, in our Church, for holding that "in the most holy "Sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the "substance of bread and wine," and "denying that "wonderful and remarkable conversion of the whole "substance of bread into the Body, and of the whole "substance of wine into the Blood, so that there re-

[1] Sess. 12. can. 2.

"main only the appearances of bread and wine," "which," it proceeds, "the [Roman] Catholic Church "most aptly terms Transubstantiation." We suppose, also, that they meant it in a carnal and erroneous sense, that they say, "that the Body and Blood of "Christ is" not only "really," but "*substantially* pre- "sent in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist;" for "substantially" they explain to be not simply equivalent to "really," but "corporeally[1]," that "the "Body of the LORD is *sensibly*[2] touched by the hands, "broken and bruised by the teeth." Further, we think it presumptuous to define, as they do[3], that "Christ is wholly contained under each species," whereby they would excuse their modern innovation of denying the cup to the laity, and would persuade them by a self-invented and unauthorized theory of modern days, that they receive no detriment thereby. Again, we hold it rash to define peremptorily, "that[4] "the Body and Blood of Christ remain in the con- "secrated elements, which are not consumed, or are "reserved after the Communion," (meaning thereby that they so remain, independently of any subsequent participation, as of the sick, or by the communicants) although doubtless they are not common bread and wine, but hallowed. Then, also, we reject what Rome maintains under an anathema, "that[5] "in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ

[1] *E. g.* Bellarm. Controv. de Sacr. Euch. L. 1. c. 11.
[2] Id. Ib. L. 3. c. 24.
[3] L. c. cap. 3, and Can. 3.
[4] Can. 4.
[5] Can. 6.

" the Only-begotten Son of God, is to be adored " with the outward adoration of Divine worship, and " to be set forth publicly to the people, in order to " be adored," nay, " that this most holy Sacrament " rightly received the same Divine worship as is due " to the true God: and that it was not therefore the " less to be adored, because instituted by Christ the " Lord to be received. For that the same Eternal " God was present in it, Whom, when the Eternal " Father brought into the world, He said, And let " all the angels of God worship Him." Lastly, as connected with and dependent upon transubstantiation, we cannot but hold that the " Sacrifice of " masses, in the which it was commonly said that the " Priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to " have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphem- " ous fables and dangerous deceits," and interfere " with the offering of Christ once made" upon the Cross.

These are the modern corruptions of Rome, which our Church, in her Articles, condemns; and against these, which all spring from the one invention of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, we have repeatedly and often strongly spoken[1]. We have specified the refusal of the cup to the laity, as *one* of the practical grievances of the Church of Rome, which should alone, without further disputing, restrain any from joining himself

[1] See Appendix, Nos. 14. 25. 31, 32, 33. 35. 49. 78. and reprint of Bp. Cosin, ib. Nos. 10, 11.

to her Communion[1]. How it may be with those, who have access to no other, we have no right to determine, though one cannot doubt but that they sustain herein a grievous loss; and the miserable state of Roman Catholic countries in general, may be, in part, owing to this loss: but, for any voluntarily to cast himself out of a Communion, as our own, in the which he may receive it, and to join himself to that in which it is denied him, is such a wanton trifling with privileges, and casting away of God's gifts, and tempting of Him, that I should think this ground alone (which any plain man can understand) reason enough why no member of our Church should join her. It was felt at the time of the Reformation, to be a very great practical cruelty; so much so, that observers of no mean note have not doubted, that it was the chief ground why the religious so earnestly sought for a Reformation, and that, had Rome conceded this point, the Reformation would never have taken place in the way in which it did. Rome admitted that her modern practice was contrary to the institution of our Lord, and contrary also to the mode in which the Church Universal, for nearly thirteen centuries of her existence, had interpreted that Institution[2]; but in that wantonnesss of authority,

[1] Ib. Nos. 14. 22.

[2] "This present holy general Council determines—that al-
"though Christ instituted the venerable Sacrament after supper,
"and administered it to His disciples under both kinds of bread
"and wine, yet, notwithstanding, the laudable authority of the

into which her assumed infallibility betrayed her, she preferred contravening Antiquity, and risking division, rather than abandon any practice which she had established, even though not, as she professes,

" sacred Canons and the approved custom of the Church has and " does observe, that this Sacrament ought not to be consecrated " after supper, nor received by the faithful except fasting, except " in case of sickness, &c. and in like way, that although this " Sacrament was in the Primitive Church received by the faithful " under both kinds, yet to avoid any perils and scandals, the " custom has with reason been introduced, that it be received by " the officiating priests in both kinds, and by lay people, under " the kind of bread only." Council of Constance, sess. 13. Vasquez (quoted by Bp. Hall, 'The Old Religion,' c. 8.) says, " We " cannot deny that in the Latin Church there was the use of " both kinds, and that it so continued until the days of St. Tho- " mas, which was about the year of God, 1260." " Thus it " was," adds Bp. Hall, " in the Roman Church; but as for the " Greek, the world knows it never did communicate but under " both kinds. These open confessions spare us the labour of " quoting the several testimonies of later ages."

This instance illustrates the difference between the mode in which Anglo and Roman-Catholics view the relation of the Church to Holy Scripture; Anglo-Catholics take the two facts, that the Church never did consecrate after supper, but always did administer in two kinds, as an authoritative interpretation of our LORD's will, and supposes that He willed what He did to be followed in the one case, not in the other: the Romish Church regards the former only as a proof of the dispensing power of the Church, and so proceeds to dispense in the other, *contrary* to primitive practice. Thus, Anglo-Catholics take the Primitive Church in both cases as a witness; Romanists make her a judge, and as establishing a precedent only, which the existing Church may follow out at her own discretion.

matter of faith. Yet she would not depart from her existing customs, or the tradition of two centuries; and so being unable to justify herself on Scripture, as explained by Antiquity, she had recourse to *à priori* grounds, "that[1] it is most firmly "to be believed, and no wise to be doubted, that the "whole Body and Blood of Christ is truly contained "as well under the form of bread as under the form "of wine." Miserable and rationalistic arguments in Divine Mysteries! as if, where all is subject of Faith, there were any safe rule but to adhere as closely as possible to what seems to be the Divine Ordinance. It seems strange that that misguided Church should not have felt the risk of declaring what the Church Universal had of old esteemed part of the Divine Institution, to be superfluous, and did not dread thus tempting God to withdraw His grace altogether, which they thus presumptuously argued about. This rationalistic argument was met in its own way, that if additional grace were not bestowed through the communion of the Cup, then, "the[2] administering Priest received no bene-"fit from it, and (painful as it is to state it) it was "wholly useless and indifferent." Thus a feigned reverence, (lest haply some accident should befall the consecrated element,) covered a real irreverence;

[1] Council of Constance, l. c.

[2] By many Theologians even of the Council of Trent. Sarpi, L. 6. c. 30. where several other arguments are given.

and real unbelief as to the Virtue of the Sacramental Blood was veiled by a scrupulous care for Its protection. So it ever is, when men forget that "to obey is better than Sacrifice," and would be more jealous for the honour of holy things, than GOD who gave them. The honour of the Eucharist was alleged; the honour of man was the secret motive, lest by concession of the Cup to the laity, the dignity of the Priesthood should be levelled[1]. But thus Rome, rashly binding itself to the hasty and presumptuous decision of the Council of Constance, has inflicted a grievous privation upon her own members, and placed a mark upon herself, which must ever be a hindrance to her own power, and prevent her recovering her undue sway over our Church. An instinctive devotion will guide and protect the religious members of our Church, who might otherwise have been just the most alive to the splendour of many of her pretensions. They might not be able to disentangle their way amid abstract arguments; but they will feel that it would be a loss to be deprived of their SAVIOUR'S Blood. Those who engage unprepared in abstract controversies may relapse; the devout Communicant will be safe, who argues not, but obeys. All which Rome could give them, they have already in the Church wherein they were baptized; and they have more. Not here to mention the risk of forfeiture which might be in-

[1] Tridentine Theologians, ap. Sarpi, l. c. especially the Spanish, ib. c. 31.

volved in joining what is here a Schismatic Communion, our Church, though she rightly reject the Sacrifice of Masses, has ever been acknowledged to have that whereof it is the corruption, the true commemorative Sacrifice, representing to GOD the Death and Passion of his Son, and so acceptable to Him, such as the Church Catholic ever held it[1]; she has the true communion of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, administered by those ordained by the successors of the Apostles, and that, unimpaired by any "will-worship or voluntary humility," which pretending a self-invented respect, would deprive the laity of a portion of their inheritance and of GOD's gift. We need not now put ourselves in the position that Rome would concede this, and retain her other corruptions[2]; to concede it, Rome must be other than she now is; a strong ground for refusing it was, lest other demands should be made of her[3]. Why then distract ourselves with such gratuitous hypotheses that Rome would concede, what

[1] See Catena, No. 4. Tracts, No. 81, "Testimony of writers of "the later English Church to the doctrine of the Eucharistic "Sacrifice, with an historical account of the changes made in the "Liturgy as to the expression of that doctrine." Courayer, Défense de la Dissert. sur la Validité des Ordinations Anglaises, l. 4. c. 6.

[2] Essays on the Church, p. 292.

[3] This was urged by the Spanish Bishops, and those dependent upon Spain, who were the chief opposers of the concession of the Cup at the Council of Trent, Sarpi, l. 6. c. 31. and influenced the legates to resist the united applications of the Imperial and French Ambassadors, ib. c. 35.

for above four centuries she has not conceded? Why suppose that what she refused, when pressed by people and emperors [1], when she might thereby have retained whole Churches in her Communion, she would now grant in the hope of recovering a few individuals, and thereby own herself doubly in error? Why embarrass ourselves with imagining that what she refused at Trent because she had refused it at Constance, she should now concede, although she has sanctioned by an anathema [2] the *à priori* ground upon which she refused it? She can concede it only on the supposition that the urgent

[1] The Ambassadors of the Emperor and of Bavaria were especially urgent at the Council of Trent, for the restoration of the Cup; they were joined by those of France, Sarpi, l. vi. c. 35. The Imperial ambassadors urged that there "were Catholics in "Hungary, Austria, Moravia, Silesia, Carinthia, Carniola, Styria, "Bavaria, Suabia, and other parts of Germany, who ardently de-"sired the cup;" in Hungary they went so far, as to "oblige the "Priests, by depriving them of their goods, and threatening of "their life, to administer the cup to them." The Imperial and Bavarian ambassadors continued to urge the Council and the Pope, both during its Session and after its close. Sarpi, ib. c. 53; vii. 47; viii. 88. Cassander (ap. Bp. Hall, l. c.) says, "Wherefore not without cause are most of the best Catholics, and "most conversant in the reading of Ecclesiastical writers, in-"flamed with an earnest desire of obtaining the cup of the Lord; "that the Sacrament may be brought back to that ancient custom "and use, which hath been for many ages perpetuated in the "Universal Church." "We need," adds Bp. Hall, "no other "advocate."

[2] Sess. 21. can. 3.

demand of it is reasonable; but she has anathematized those "who deny that Jesus Christ, the "Author and Source of all grace, is received "wholly and entirely under one species," and so has cut herself off from thinking the demand reasonable; and yet, by the strange destiny annexed to these presumptuous reasonings, she has elsewhere awakened the suspicion of loss attached to the denial of the Cup, which she would here allay. For since many members of the Synod of Trent did think it a loss [1], she was constrained elsewhere simply to state, "that [2] the faithful who receive under the "one species of bread, are not deprived of any grace "*necessary to salvation*," and so, as was at the time remarked [3], she "in a manner avowed that they are "deprived of some grace, though not absolutely "necessary. Whereupon they asked, has any human "authority the power to hinder the super-abundant "and non-necessary grace of God? and if so, does "charity admit of thus placing hindrances in the way "of good?" Thus she has placed herself in the position of making unauthorized distinctions as to the grace necessary for us in working out our salvation, and exhibits herself as an unnatural mother, who half-recognizes that what she withholds is a blessing, and yet refuses it.

But, so closely do faithful adherence to Apostolic

[1] Visconti ap. Courayer, notes to Sarpi, l. 6. c. 39.

[2] Sess. 21. cap. 3.

[3] Remarks on the Decree recorded by Sarpi, l. c.

doctrine and to Apostolic practice accompany each other, it is plain, my Lord, that it is only upon the high Catholic doctrine of the Holy Communion, that the denial of the Cup is a privation. They who receive the holy elements faithfully, acknowledge, as they receive each consecrated element, that they are receiving respectively, "the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for" them, and His Blood which was for them shed. They reason not, how His Body is separate from His Blood, or what additional blessing the Communion of His Blood bestows upon them. Instinctive reverence, the fruit of reverent Communion, forbids them to inquire or to risk a forfeiture. They pray, "that their sinful bodies may "be made clean by His Body, and their souls washed "by His most precious Blood;" they hear, severally, the ancient and hallowed words of the Universal Church, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," .... "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ;" and with an unreasoning piety, which has a mightier hold than any subtilty of Romanist distinction, they would dread to forfeit either portion of the Gift bestowed upon them. But upon any Ultra-Protestant theory, which regards the consecrated elements as "visible symbols of His *absent* Body and Blood," as representations, means of kindling our faith, and the like, the privation of the Cup were no loss. Whosoever having embraced this theory, should continue to regard it as such, must do so by virtue of a piety which his theory had not mastered. It is the *reality* of the Communication of

His blood by *means* of those forms which He has instituted to convey It, which makes "the Cup which we bless" a blessing, its loss a privation. They who think of the Holy Symbols, as outward only, may retain them as an act of obedience, (and so far is well,) but cannot feel it an essential Blessing. And thus, my Lord, it again appears how a jealous adherence to the high Catholic Doctrines of Antiquity is at the same time a safeguard to retain the affections of our people. Such is not our *end;* but it is a *reward* annexed to faithfulness. Whether those who blame us for insisting so much upon this practical cruelty of the Church of Rome, would themselves feel it as a cruelty, or adequately appreciate the blessings which they enjoy through the restoration of Primitive practice in our Church, is for them to determine.

On the other hand, our Church, as holding the original Catholic truth, of which the corruptions of Rome are the debasement, appears to me yet further removed from those modern traditions, the inventions of men who deny that truth. Rome, in this respect, has the truth, though mingled with error, and clouded and injured by it; the Zuingli-Calvinist School have forfeited it. In a word, our Church holds with Rome the *reality* of the Communication of the Body and Blood of CHRIST through the Holy Eucharist, but denies her carnal way of explaining it, and protests against the corruptions thereby entailed; but in what Rome retains in truth

she must needs hold with her against those who, explaining to human reason Divine mysteries, cannot but explain away what is mysterious, and resolve the hidden gifts of the Sacrament into aids of contemplation, outward attestations of GOD's gifts, exhibitions to our outward senses, mere remembrances of His death.

I would only observe, in conclusion of this topic, that I wish not to ascribe to our accusers the whole extent of Zuinglian doctrine, however I must think that they fall short of the doctrines of our Church. Happily, the faith of individuals is so sustained by the Liturgy of our Church, that few carry out the erroneous notions of a foreign school, even while they form their minds in it, or embrace detached views out of it. I wish not to speak of individuals, but of systems; individuals, I doubt not, are better than their systems, and far other than their system would be, if developed without restraint; the devotions of our Church have influenced such of her members far more than they are probably themselves aware, and have conveyed to them truth, which they are afraid to express in words, lest it should tend to the exaltation of what seems to them outward; we would not blame *them;* we would only wish to exhibit to them the system which they have partially embraced, that they might extricate themselves wholly from it.

Art. XXIII. *Of ministering in the Congregation.*

We have no objection to admit that the Articles of Edward VI., from which our present are, with some modifications, derived, were formed upon a plan of comprehension; it is an historical [1] fact that, although the scheme failed, they were intended as a general basis of union of Protestants in one Episcopal body. Nor does there seem any necessity that a Church, whose ministers are episcopally ordained, should put forth any formal statement that they must of necessity be so. We therefore acquiesce very readily in the indefiniteness of our Article on this head, which states that we ought "to judge "those lawfully called and sent, which be chosen "and called to this work by men, who have public "authority given unto them in the Congregation to "call and send Ministers into the LORD's vineyard," without defining who are invested with this authority. For if any one be willing himself to receive Ordination at the hands of a Bishop, surely, my Lord, nothing further is gained by requiring him to confess that this is the only lawful Ordination. But comprehensive Articles are not at the same time exclusive. Our Articles surely are not in such wise a rule of belief, that we are to hold nothing for true which is not contained in them; we are not bound to have no opinion *beside* them, provided we hold

[1] See Authorities, Tract 81. p. 27. *note*.

none *against* them. Yet this is what these charges come to. The compilers of the Articles, intending them for subscription, *required* no more definite opinion upon the subject; therefore, say these, they forbade it. But the Articles are not the only, often not the fullest, statements of the doctrines or tenets of our Church. They are often to be interpreted or to be filled up out of her other documents. Thus as, on the Sacraments, the teaching of the Articles is materially cleared and filled up by the Catechism and the Services, so, on Ordination, a consistent Churchman would naturally have recourse to those services to which in her Articles (Art. XXXVI.) she refers. The Preface then to "the Form and Manner of "making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, "Priests, and Deacons," thus speaks:

"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the "Holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that *from the* "*Apostles' time*, there have been these Orders of "Ministers in CHRIST'S Church—Bishops, Priests, and "Deacons.—And therefore to the intent that these "Orders may be *continued*, and reverently used and "esteemed, in the united Church of England and "Ireland, no man shall be accounted and taken to "be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the united "Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to ex-"ecute any of the said functions, except he be called, "tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according "to the form hereafter following, or hath had for-"merly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination."

For herself, then, clearly, our Church regards none to be lawfully consecrated or ordained except those who have received Episcopal Consecration or Ordination; and, in her practice, conformably to this rule, she admits a Romish Priest, who relinquishes his errors, to exercise his functions without re-ordination, but not one who has received Presbyterian Ordination. The principles, however, of this Preface go further; for Episcopacy is stated to be an Apostolic Ordinance, and if Apostolic, then Divine. And this view I need not say has been held by the great stream of our Divines[1]; nor, having an Apostolic Ordinance, have men, until lately, been ashamed to avow it.

It would then be altogether inexplicable how the avowal of what is commonly entitled "Apostolical succession" should have been received with so much tumult, had one not reason to believe, that many of the anonymous writers, who have been for some years raising it, belong to bodies which have forfeited that Ordinance.

Leaving these, however, I might take this occasion to remove some of the misconceptions which have been raised about it. The objection is ordinarily thus couched: "If the Sacraments are necessary to salva-
"tion, and can only be administered by one Episco-
"pally ordained, then among Presbyterian bodies
"there are no Sacraments, and consequently no sal-

[1] See Catena Patrum, No. 1. Tracts, No. 74.

" vation, or at least they are left to the uncovenanted " mercies of God."

Yet to make deductions from a doctrine, is not the safest way of understanding it. Men in these days are not apt to infer, that because there is no salvation except through the name of JESUS CHRIST, therefore all the Heathen must be condemned; nay, though our Articles say, that they are to be " held accursed " that presume to say that every one shall be saved " by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he " be diligent to frame his life according to that law " and the light of nature," (Art. XVIII.) people are content to stop short, resting in the positive revealed truth, that salvation is through CHRIST alone; but not inquiring " who then shall be saved ?"

And within these same bounds we have confined ourselves. Episcopacy and Presbyterianism (as excluding Episcopacy) cannot be true together, any more than any other two opposites. If Episcopacy be Apostolic and an ordinance of GOD, Presbyterianism is not; if Presbyterianism is, then Episcopacy is not; and this was ever so held until these modern days, when men have consented to merge their differences in a common indifference; and is probably still held by the Dissenters from our Church. For they felt that to justify their schism, it was necessary to show that our Church required things unlawful, and Episcopacy was accordingly counted among the signs that our Church was a portion of Antichrist. Episcopacy was denounced as Antichristian[1].

[1] See *e.g.* Archbishop Bramhall quoted below, p. 165. Beza

Without imitating their harshness, we, in our turn, would say, since Episcopacy is an Ordinance of God, to abandon it is sin; the degree of that sin, or its effects, we are not called upon to pronounce on, nor would we. Only, as watchmen, we are bound to warn against this, as against every other sin; and the more against this, because men are now so careless about it. Even Calvin spoke very differently when he said, "they are worthy of any Anathema, who[1], when they can have Bishops, have them not." So neither then would we take upon ourselves to say any thing as to the efficacy of the Sacraments administered by those whom we cannot hold to have been rightly ordained. We hold only that they have not *duly received the Commission* to administer them. And this will be plain to any Presbyter, if he make the case his own. As Presbyters, we *received no Commission*, either alone, or in conjunction with others, to ordain others to dispense the word of God, and His holy Sacraments; and what we have not received, we cannot give. That word and those Sacraments

divides Episcopacy into Divine, human, and Satanic. Divine, according to him, is the ministry generally; human, is the placing one Presbyter above the rest with limited authority; Satanic, is where the Episcopacy is entirely separate from the Presbytery, and has exclusive authority. This is repeated by the Puritan writers in their answers of the English Church, *e.g.* Calderwood, Altare Damascenum, c. 4; yet Beza himself said of our Bishops, "Let her enjoy this singular bounty of God, which "I wish she may hold for ever." (Quoted by Bp. Hall, Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. i. c. 4.)

[1] See Bp. Hall, Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. i. c.2.

we do administer, because we have been commissioned so to do; we do not pretend to empower others, because, not being commissioned, we have not been empowered. In like manner, neither Luther nor Wesley, (any more than Calvin, who was himself never ordained,) had any commission, by themselves, or with other Presbyters, to ordain others; and so those ordained by them *have received no commission* to administer the Sacraments. Mere length of time cannot mend the original invalidity. And this original difficulty seems to have been felt alike by Luther and Wesley. It is well known that Wesley reluctantly took the step of ordaining at all; that he meant those whom he ordained, to be subordinate auxiliaries to the ministry; and that, to the last, he refused, in the strongest terms, his consent that those thus ordained should take upon them to administer the Sacraments[1]; he felt that it exceeded his powers, and so inhibited it, however it might diminish the numbers of the society he had framed. In like manner Luther, as has been observed[2], gave to those ordained by him, new titles; not venturing to attribute

[1] He was consulted how to proceed with a society, who threatened to leave the Connexion, unless permitted to have the Sacraments administered by their own preachers. His answer was, "Modern laziness has jumbled together the two distinct offices of "preaching and administering the Sacraments. But, be that as "it may, I will rather lose twenty societies than separate from "the Church." This was only about three years before his death. The letter was first published in the Brit. Mag. vol. vi. p. 297.

[2] Palmer on the Church, part i. c. 12. sect. 4. t. i. p. 387.

to them those belonging to the offices conferred by the regular ordination. But irregular practice is the parent of irregular principles; and the wider deviation incident to that practice begets a new train of principles. Man must justify himself in his own sight; if then he conform not his practice to his principles, his practice will bend his principles. The legality of even Presbyterian Ordination, the theory, that the right of Ordination resides "in the body corporate of the Church[1]" (to be of any use in this argument it must be "in any section of the Church"), these and the like are so many after-thoughts to justify what was done in the first instance on Saul's plea of "necessity;" "I[2] forced myself therefore, and offered a burnt-offering."

But while maintaining that they only are *commissioned* to administer the Sacraments, who have received that commission from those appointed in succession to bestow it, we have never denied that God *may* make His own Sacraments efficacious, even when irregularly administered; we should trust it might be so: some of us are bound up by ties of affection to those very Protestant bodies which it is supposed we should so harshly and wantonly cut off from the Church of Christ. The very same affection for them which would make us long to see them safely restored to the full privileges of the Church, makes us trust that the Father of mercies has not

[1] Episcopacy, Tradition, and the Sacraments, considered in reference to the Oxford Tracts, p. 21.

[2] 1 Sam. xiii. 12.

" one blessing" only, but has "a blessing for them also, even for them."

Still every one would apprehend risk in certain cases of irregularity: few, for instance, would think themselves safe in receiving the LORD'S Supper from a layman or from a woman; and the greater the irregularity, and the less excuse for it, the greater would be esteemed the risk. Thus dissenters would obviously run greater risk of having the efficacy of the Sacraments diminished, than the present Presbyterians of Scotland; and these perhaps more than the German bodies, whose forefathers did not wilfully renounce the privilege of Episcopacy, and have not a pure Apostolic Church with which they might unite, nor have had before their eyes the instructive example of her patient and suffering piety. Nor, again, are we called upon to think what mitigating effect inveterate prejudice may have; the present Protestants have been brought into their state not by their own deed, but by the acts of former generations. Their continuance in that state may be an evil and a loss of privileges, entailed upon them by the act of their forefathers, which they have not cut off; but not the same to individuals as if they had been the authors of it. On the other hand, it is for them to consider that they have not the same plea of necessity which their forefathers urged; that they may readily repair the irregularity for the future; that such an act would doubtless be pleasing to GOD, as evincing an anxiety to conform themselves altogether to His will, and so might bring down a blessing on them-

selves, as well as contribute to the ultimate restoration of unity in the whole Church.

But our immediate practical question is at home. And what Churchman would venture to say that none of the dissenters, that no shade of them, run *any* risk? that people were *equally safe* as to the LORD'S Supper, however administered? that if administered by the congregation to each other, that if a family were to administer it among themselves, they would be *quite secure?* And if there is risk in dispensing with a Minister altogether, why should men be quite certain that there is none in dispensing with one Apostolically ordained? why should we think it an unreasonable thing, that risk should be involved in neglecting an Ordinance of GOD? The Church of old held that the efficacy of the Sacraments, even when administered by ordained but schismatic ministers, was, at the least, suspended, so long as persons remained in schism. This is the ground which we have taken, not involving ourselves and others needlessly in questions as to GOD'S dealings with others, but providing, as far as in us lay, for the safety of our own people. We have told them, that, at the least, they are safer if they abide in the Church. I might cite to this end, one of the earliest tracts [1] in this

[1] Tract. 4. p. 3. The question, "Do you then unchurch all the Presbyterians?" was also there answered, p. 5, and many hard words might have been saved, had persons read what is said in the Tracts, instead of making inferences from them, unread. The kirk of Scotland was also kindly spoken of, in the very poem, so often cited in proof of want of charity towards it; "Samaria."

series, when the Apostolic succession, being so lost out of sight, was more continually put forward than there is, happily, now any occasion to do. "JESUS "CHRIST's own commission is the best external secu- "rity I can have, that in receiving this bread and "wine, I verily receive His Body and Blood. Either "the Bishops have that commission, or there is no "such thing in the world. For, at least, Bishops "have it with as much evidence as Presbyters with- "out them. In proportion, then, to my Christian "anxiety for keeping as near my Saviour as I can, I "shall of course be very unwilling to separate myself "from Episcopal communion. And in proportion to

There is certainly an analogy between the proceedings of Jeroboam and those of John Knox. The making of the calves, although eminently "*the* sin wherewith Jeroboam made Israel to sin," was not his only sin: it is added, "he made priests out of all the people, "which were not of the sons of Levi," (the Hebrew word means rather, "out of the people indiscriminately," than as in the E. V. "of the lowest of the people,") and these were to offer not to the calves, but "on the high places," where the true God was worshipped, though not as He had appointed. This sin then was a self-chosen ordination. And this Scotland likewise committed, in rejecting Episcopacy, which she already had in a pure Church. As God, however, left not Samaria without seers, so also has He raised up gifted men for Scotland, and has doubtless among those, who have forsaken the Apostolic Church, His 7000, who have not been involved in any of the further consequences of that first sin. Tract 47 (on the "Visible Church," No. 4) contains a warm statement how the sense of the superior privileges of our Church is compatible with charity, and tends to individual humility.

" my charitable care for others, will be my industry " to preserve and extend the like consolation and " security to them." And again [1], " Why should we " talk so much of an 'establishment,' and so little of " an 'Apostolical Succession?' Why should we not " seriously endeavour to impress *our people* with this " plain truth—that by separating themselves from our " communion, they separate themselves not only from " a decent, orderly, useful society, but from the only " Church in this realm which *has a right to be quite* " *sure* that she has the LORD's Body to give to the " people."

And this language does not at all go beyond the glowing words of Hooker, in vindicating the Divine commission which must necessarily belong to " the ministry in things divine." And he too, however he might make allowances for cases of apparent necessity (which was the more natural in those times, when the tendency of Ultra-Protestantism had not been developed), held that the Episcopal Ordination was the only authorized transmission of that authority [2]. He says then [3] . . . " In that they are CHRIST's " ambassadors and His labourers, who shall give them " their commission, but He Whose most inward " affairs they manage? Is not GOD alone the Father

[1] Tract 4. p. 5.

[2] See Mr. Keble's Preface to Hooker, p lxv—lxx.

[3] Eccl. Pol. V. lxxvii. 1, 2. 7. ed. Keble, quoted Tracts, No. 74. Catena, No. 1. " Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of the Apostolical succession."

" of spirits? Are not souls the purchase of JESUS
" CHRIST? What angel in heaven could have said
" to man, as our LORD did unto Peter, 'Feed My
" sheep,—preach—baptize—do this in remembrance
" of Me. Whose sins ye retain, they are retained;
" and their offences in heaven pardoned, whose
" faults you shall on earth forgive?' What think
" we? Are these terrestrial sounds, or else are
" they voices uttered out of the clouds above? The
" power of the ministry of GOD translateth out of
" darkness into glory; it raiseth man from the
" earth and bringeth GOD Himself from heaven; *by*
" *blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible*
" *graces;* it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; *it hath to*
" *dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of*
" *the world, and the Blood which was poured out to*
" *redeemed souls;* when it poureth malediction upon
" the heads of the wicked, they perish; when it re-
" voketh the same, they revive. O wretched blind-
" ness, if we admire not so great power; more
" wretched if we consider it aright, and notwith-
" standing, imagine that any but GOD can bestow it
" To whom CHRIST hath imparted power, both over
" that mystical body which is the society of souls,
" and over that natural which is Himself, for the
" knitting of both in one (a work which Antiquity
" doth call the making of CHRIST's Body), the same
" power is in such not amiss both termed a kind of
" mark or character, and acknowledged to be indeli-
" ble. . . . . 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins

" soever ye remit, they are remitted; whose sins ye " retain, they are retained.' Whereas, therefore, the " other Evangelists had set down, that CHRIST did, " before His suffering, promise to give His Apostles " the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and being risen " from the dead, promised moreover at that time a " miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, St. John " addeth, that He also invested them even then " with the power of the Holy Ghost for castigation " and relaxation of sin, wherein was fully accom- " plished that which the promise of the keys did im- " port. Seeing, therefore, that the same power is " now given, why should the same form of words " expressing it be thought foolish?"

We would speak then, my Lord, as we have spoken, *positively;* we would point out to those who are of our Communion, this security in remaining in her, to those who, or their forefathers, have deserted her, the superior safety in returning to her. The argument, that they only can lawfully administer in Divine things, who have been called thereto, is so plain, and so impressed upon men's minds by natural reverence, that such as have had no outward call, have ever rested their claim upon an inward call; and so acknowledge the principle: but however men have in this way persuaded themselves that they were called to preach the word, no one, I believe, ever yet imagined himself so called to administer the Sacraments. Indeed the general tendency of this class has been to neglect the Sacraments, and

substitute preaching for them, following that to which they conceived themselves called, and magnifying it to the derogation of the Ordinances, to administer which they had no call. The administration of the Sacraments, when it has been ventured upon, has generally been, as in the case of the Wesleyans, a subsequent expedient, to round a system, and make it independent of the Church. We doubt not, then, but that, by GOD'S blessing, the more courageous avowal of the undoubted privileges of our Apostolic Church would regain many of her lost children to her, and save her from having to deplore the loss of others, would check the growth of schism, and tend to heal her breaches. And the vehemence with which this principle has been attacked by Dissenters, might show men that its importance has been felt by those without also; they would not trouble themselves about the maintenance of an abstract principle, unless they saw its tendency (which has already to some extent been realized), to strengthen the Church, and to diminish the several secessions from it. To these, our own Church's erring children, is our first duty. Yet may it perhaps not be too much to hope, that the more complete development of the principles of ourChurch, may influence also those religious bodies, the foreign Protestants, about which persons profess so much concern. And thus the time may be hastened, when we may be all "one fold under One Shepherd." Certainly, if we have been intrusted with privileges, which other reformed bodies lost, it was not, that they should be "put under a bushel, but on a candle-

"stick, that" our "candle which our GOD hath "lighted for us may give light to all them that are in "the house." It were ungrateful to ALMIGHTY GOD, Who, amid so many perils, some common to the general "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep" whereby the previous corruptions were cleansed, others peculiar to our own land, still provided that our Ark should be borne safe above the waters; it were real unkindness to other bodies of Christians, to dissemble our privileges, and not rather to glory in them and in Him who gave them, that others may be kindled with a godly zeal, and behold, and partake of them.

Although, however, we have been careful not to go beyond our measure, and have not needlessly spoken of other bodies, yet may it be useful to allude to one remarkable fact bearing on this question. The doctrine of Apostolical succession and that of the Sacraments, viewed in the abstract, would to most, probably, not seem at first sight to be so connected together, that a false view of the one would involve error upon the other; much less, that the denial of the one should entail a fundamental change in the other. Yet so it has been. It seems as though people had been deterred by an instinctive dread from taking *upon themselves* the office of administering the Holy Eucharist, with the full consciousness of its mysteriousness. It is too awful for man to undertake unbidden; he cannot invest *himself* with the belief that, in Hooker's words, "in blessing visible elements" he has the power to "make

them invisible grace," any more than he can give *himself* the commission so to do: man's belief in this awful privilege, so surpassing human thought, must come from above; he can only believe it, when he has solemnly been invested with it. Accordingly, where people have acted without this commission, there they have unconsciously lowered the doctrine. In the thoughts of many Wesleyans, at least, "means of grace" will signify—not the Holy Eucharist, but their own peculiar discipline, their "class-meetings" or their "love-feasts." They have often lost even the abstract belief, that the Holy Communion is any way more solemn, or attended with more mysterious blessing. With a ministry "not of the sons of Levi[1]," they have "ordained a feast" also "like unto the feast which is in Judah," and have come to think their own feast, which they had "devised of their own heart," to be as acceptable to GOD, and as rich in blessing to them as that "ordained by CHRIST Himself." And so likewise as to other bodies; the further any have departed from the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, so much the lower has their doctrine of the Sacraments become; as at the very outset, the system of Luther, (himself a Priest,) though in part erroneous, was higher than that of Calvin and Zuingli, who were laymen. And yet now after the lapse of three centuries, even the peculiar doctrine of Lutheranism is well nigh extinct; those who

[1] 1 Kings xii. 31—33.

maintain it are, in one large country of the reformation, a proscribed sect. Mostly, it has amalgamated itself with the Calvinistic doctrine. Shrinking then from saying any thing as to God's dealings with individuals, it would yet seem that, upon their own scheme of doctrine, the Holy Eucharist must be, to many bodies, at least, other than it is to us. For what we believe it to be, that they reject. They do not believe that it conveys really, though spiritually, the Body and Blood of CHRIST; painful as it is to say, they repudiate, as Popish, the real, invisible, Presence of CHRIST; they resolve into a figure the real actual Indwelling of CHRIST thereby. Since then faith is the means whereby *we* become partakers of the gifts already stored up for us, what would there be harsh or unkind in thinking that they had not, what they deny themselves to have? especially when our object is to persuade them to return where they may believe and may have it? It is the substance of their own statement, when one says, in a passage[1] singled out for blame, "In the judg-" ment of the Church, the Eucharist administered " without Apostolical commission, may to pious " minds be a very edifying ceremony, but it is not " that blessed thing which our Saviour graciously " meant it to be; it is not 'verily and indeed taking " and receiving' the Body and Blood of Him, our " Incarnate Lord." For they themselves so speak of

[1] Tract 66. p. 7.

it, as an outward means to kindle faith; they place the very essence of Sacraments in their instructiveness [1]; what injury then is done them, if any say that they have not, what they refuse? or why may we not claim to our own Church, what she professes to receive from GOD's all-gracious hand? What they claim, is not denied them; we trust that the "edifying rite" which they hold the Communion to be, may be, by GOD's mercy, beneficial to them; why should they grudge us its being to us "that blessed thing "which we believe our Saviour graciously meant it "to be." If they will not "enter in themselves," why should they "hinder those who are entering?"

This view of the case, whereby we are enabled to maintain uncompromisingly the truth, and yet to entertain kindly, and charitable, and sympathetic feelings for those who have lost some of the privileges of our Church, is so fully and so tenderly put by the great Bramhall, that I would again extract his words; and our previous selection of them might have shown people our sentiments, would they have read before they blamed.

"But [2] because I esteem them Churches not com-"pletely formed, do I, therefore, exclude them from

[1] See Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, p. 122-4. 245. ed. 1.

[2] Vindication of the Church of England, disc. 3. quoted more fully Tracts, No. 74. Catena on the "Apostolical succession," p. 12, 13. It appears from Abp. Bramhall, that the charge of want of charity for maintaining the Apostolical succession was then brought by the Romanists.

" all hopes of salvation? or esteem them aliens from " the commonwealth of Israel? or account them " formal schismatics? No such thing. First, I know " there are many learned persons among them who " do passionately affect Episcopacy; some of which " have acknowledged it to myself, that their Church " would never be rightly settled, until it was new " moulded [1]. Baptism is a Sacrament, the door of " Christianity, a matriculation into the Church of " CHRIST: yet the very desire of it in case of neces- " sity, is sufficient to excuse from the want of actual " Baptism. And is not the desire of Episcopacy " sufficient to excuse from the actual want of Episco- " pacy, in like case of necessity? or should I censure " these as schismatics?

" Secondly, there are others, who, though they do " not long so much for Episcopacy, yet they approve " it, and want it only out of invincible necessity. " In some places the sovereign is of another com- " munion; the Episcopal chairs are filled with Roman " Bishops. If they should petition for Bishops of " their own, it would not be granted. In other " places the magistrates have taken away Bishops; " whether out of policy, because they thought that

[1] It were difficult to point out the difference between this admission of the "Reformed" themselves, and a saying of Mr. Froude's selected for censure, as referring to the "Reformation, " every where but in England." (Essays, p. 285.) "The Reforma- " tion was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to " be righted." Remains, vol. i. p. 433.

" the regiment not so proper for their republics, or " because they were ashamed to take away the " revenues, and preserve the order, or out of a blind " zeal, they have given an account to GOD: they " owe none to me. Should I condemn all these as " schismatics for want of Episcopacy, who want it " out of invincible necessity?

" Thirdly, there are others who have neither the " same desires, nor the same esteem of Episcopacy, " but condemn it as an Antichristian innovation, and " a rag of Popery. I conceive this to be most gross " schism materially. It is ten times more schisma- " tical to desert, nay, to take away (so much as lies " in them) the whole order of Bishops, than to sub- " tract obedience from one lawful Bishop. All that " can be said to mitigate this fault is, that they do it " ignorantly, as they have been mistaught and mis- " informed. And I hope that many of them are free " from obstinacy, and hold the truth implicitly in the " preparation of their minds, being ready to receive " it when GOD shall reveal it to them. How far this " may excuse (not the crime but) their persons from " formal schism, either *à toto*, or *à tanto*, I determine " not, but leave them to stand or fall to their own " Master."

And again, in answer to the same charge whereto we are subjected, of having " a design to bring the " Pope into England," in that they " unchurch either " all or most of the Protestant Churches, and maintain " the Roman Church and not their's to be true:"

" His [1] assumption is wanting, which should be " this: but a considerable party of Episcopal divines " in England do unchurch all or most of the Protes- " tant Churches, and maintain the Roman Church to " be a true Church, and these to be no Churches. I " can assent to neither of his propositions, nor to " any part of them, as true, *sub modo*, as they are " alleged by him.

" First, I cannot assent to his major proposition, " that all those who make an ordinary personal un- " interrupted succession of Pastors, to be of the " integrity of a true Church, (which is the ground of " his exception,) have therefore an intention, or " can justly be suspected thereupon to have any " intention, to introduce the Pope. The Eastern, " Southern, and Northern Churches are all of them " for such a personal succession, and yet all of them " utter enemies to the Pope. Secondly, I cannot " assent to his minor proposition, that either all or " any considerable part of the Episcopal divines in " England, do unchurch either all or most part of the " Protestant Churches. No man is hurt but by him- " self. They unchurch none at all, but leave them " to stand or fall to their own Master. They do not " unchurch the Swedish, Danish, Bohemian Churches, " and many other Churches in Polonia, Hungaria, " and those parts of the world, who have an ordinary " uninterrupted succession of Pastors, some by the

[1] Vindication of Grotius, disc. 3. quoted ib. p. 14 & 16.

" name of Bishops, others under the name of Seniors,
" unto this day; (I meddle not with the Socinians:)
" they unchurch not the Lutheran Churches in Ger-
" many, who both assert Episcopacy in their confes-
" sions, and have actual superintendents in their
" practice, and would have Bishops, name and thing,
" if it were in their power. Let him not mistake
" himself: those Churches which he is so tender of,
" though they be better known to us by reason of
" their vicinity, are so far from being 'all or most
" part of the Protestant Churches,' that being all put
" together, they amount not to so great a proportion
" as the Britannick Churches alone. And if one
" excluded out of them all those who want an ordi-
" nary succession without their own faults, out of
" invincible ignorance or necessity, and all those who
" desire to have an ordinary succession either ex-
" plicitly or implicitly, they will be reduced to a
" little flock indeed.

" But let him set his heart at rest. I will remove
" this scruple out of his mind, that he may sleep
" securely upon both ears. Episcopal divines do not
" deny those Churches to be true churches, wherein
" salvation may be had. We advise them, as it is
" our duty, to be circumspect for themselves, and
" not to put it to more question, whether they have
" ordination or not, or desert the general practice of
" the universal Church for nothing, when they may
" clear it if they please. Their case is not the same
" with those who labour under invincible necessity.

" What mine own sense is of it, I have declared " many years since to the world in print; and in the " same way received thanks, and a public acknow- " ledgment of my moderation from a French divine. " And yet more particularly in my reply to the " Bishop of Chalcedon, Pres. p. 144. and cap. 1. p. " 164. Episcopal divines will readily subscribe to " the determination of the learned Bishop of Win- " chester, in his answer to the Second Epistle of " Molineus. ' Nevertheless, if our form (of Episco- " pacy) be of divine right, it doth not follow from " thence, that there is no salvation without it, or " that a Church cannot consist without it. He is " blind who does not see Churches consisting without " it: he is hard-hearted who denieth them salvation. " We are none of those hard-hearted persons, we put " a great difference between these things. There " may be something absent in the exterior regiment, " which is of divine right, and yet salvation to be " had.' This mistake proceedeth, from not distin- " guishing between the true nature and essence of a " Church, which we do readily grant them, and the " integrity or perfection of a Church, which we can- " not grant them, without swerving from the judg- " ment of the Catholic Church."

Exactly the same line is taken by the mild and moderate Bishop Hall, as all know, a tender lover of peace, and whose natural prejudices, through his education by a Puritan mother, ran the other way; yet these were his matured thoughts. It is well also

to hear the solemn feelings with which he commenced his "Episcopacy by Divine Right." "For me, I am "now breathing towards the end of my race, the "goal is already in my eyes—I that am now setting "foot over the threshold of the house of my age, "what aim can I have but the issue of my last "account, whereto I am ready to be summoned "before the Judge of quick and dead? Setting, "therefore, that awful Tribunal, to which we shall "shortly be presented, before our eyes, let us reason "the case with a modest earnestness." This frame of mind of the aged and pious man, who thought the defence of Episcopacy, as a "Divine institution," an acceptable employment of his latter days, when "the time of his departure was at hand," is surely somewhat different from those of the younger men now, who adduce anxiety about the Apostolic succession as a foremost testimony, that we "pay[1] "greater attention to the form and vehicle in which "the divine mercy is conveyed to us, than to the "truth and power of the blessing itself." Bishop Hall then proceeds to distinguish between the case of the Scottish Bishop, with whom he was expostulating for having renounced his Episcopal function, and that of the foreign Protestant bodies; "know[2], their case "and your's is far enough different; they plead to be "by a kind of necessity cast upon that condition,

[1] Essays on the Church, p. 309, 10.

[2] Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. 1. § 2.

" which you have willingly chosen; they were not, " they could not be, what you were, and still might " have been. Did any of them forsake and ab- " jure that function of Episcopacy, which he might " freely have enjoyed with the full liberty of pro- " fessing the reformed religion?" It is then on this same plea of *necessity*, that Bishop Hall excused the German reformers:—because[1] they were willing to " maintain and establish Episcopal government, de- " sirous to restore it, troubled that they might not " continue it: might they have enjoyed the Gospel, " they would have enjoyed Episcopacy;" " all the " world sees the Apologist professeth for them, [the " German reformers,] that they greatly desired to " conserve the government of Bishops, that they were " altogether unwillingly driven from it; that it was " utterly against their heart, that it should have been " impaired or weakened; that it was only the per- " sonal cruelty and violence of their Romish perse- " cutors which was then excepted against;" he excuses it, because[2] " they took up this equality of govern- " ment only provisionally;" because " they meant not " to traverse the state of the Clergy, or to submit it to " their orders, whensoever the Clergy or whole state " of France should happen to admit the Reformation;" because " they were by the iniquity of their times in " a manner forcibly driven *(at least as they imagined)*

[1] Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. i. § 3.

[2] Ib. § 5.

" upon this form, and necessarily put to their choice " whether they would still submit to Popery, or no " longer submit to Episcopal Administration, which " there was only managed by Popish hands." He likens the abandonment of Episcopacy in such a case, to a " mariner casting out his goods in a storm," " cutting off a limb to prevent the deadly malignity " of a gangrene," " pulling down the next roof when " an house is on fire in the City;" and yet though he would not take upon himself to judge others, yet we see that he himself would have waited, with a more constant faith, " until the tyranny were over-past," rather than throw over with his own hands the deposit committed to him. " Fear not, thou bearest Cæsar" was thought assurance enough when the storm lay vehemently upon his vessel; much more then to us, " Fear not, thou bearest an Ordinance of " thy Lord's; it is thy Lord Himself ' asleep in the " hinder part of the ship.' " For in the midst of this palliation of their case, Bishop Hall cannot but express his own doubts, whether any plea of necessity should have been admitted in such a case: " Though also," he adds, " it is very considerable, *whether the condition* " *they were in, doth altogether absolutely warrant such a* " *proceeding;* for was it not so with us, after Reforma- " tion was stept in, during those fiery times of Queen " Mary? Was it not so with you, when those holy " men, Patrick Hamilton, and George Wischart, " sowed the first seeds of Reformation among you " in their own blood? With that spirit the Holy

" Ghost indued them, of patience and constancy " crowned with martyrdom, not of tumult and oppo- " sition, to the disquiet of the state and hazard of the " reformation itself; or to the abjuring and blasphem- " ing of an holy Order in the Church, and dis- " honouring of Almighty God, while they pretended to " seek His honour." Moreover Bishop Hall only excuses, in a degree, those who did this upon necessity, as they thought, in order the more strongly to contrast their case with that of those who did the same without necessity. " This was their case; but what " is this to your's? Your [the Scotch] Church was " happily gone out of Babylon; your and our most " gracious and religious sovereign sincerely professeth, " maintaineth, encourageth, the blessedly-reformed " religion; his Bishops preach for it, write for it, and " profess themselves ready, after the example of their " predecessors, to bleed for it. And how can you " now think of paralleling your condition with the " foreign?" The loss of Episcopacy, when it seemed for the time that it could not be had, Bishop Hall looks upon with " pity[1];" its voluntary rejection he entitles, " to[2] cast mire in the faces of the blessed " Apostles, who received it from their God and Sa- " viour, and, by the guidance of His Spirit, ordained " it:" those who had abandoned it he " beseeches[3] " and adjures by that love they profess to bear to " the truth of God, by that tender respect they bear

[1] Epistle dedicatory. [2] P. 1. § 1. [3] P. 3. § 8.

" to the peace of His Zion, by their zeal to the Gospel " of CHRIST, by their main care of their happy account " one day before the tribunal of the most righteous " Judge of the quick and dead; to lay all this that " he had said, seriously together," and " for God's " sake and his own, not upon groundless suggestion " to abandon GOD's truth and ordinance, and adore " an idol made of the ear-rings of the people, and " fashioned out with the graving-tool of a supposed " skilful Aaron;" " and for you," he adds [1], " my " dearly beloved brethren at home, for CHRIST's sake, " for the Church's sake, for your souls' sake, be ex- " horted to hold fast to this holy Institution of your " Blessed Saviour, and His unerring Apostles, and " bless God for Episcopacy."

So might an aged saint write, when our evils were yet fresh, and our wounds green; but now that they are thought past healing, it is to be held that they are not wounds, but natural functions of the body. Truth is to be held one thing in England, another across the Tweed. Alas for the change, when "the holy Institution of our blessed Saviour" is held to be a thing wholly outward, and anxiety for it a sign of formalism!

But the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, rightly put forward, does not protect our people against dissent, or Ultra-Protestantism only; it is equally a protection against Rome. And hence have

[1] § 9.

the agents of that Church "sought" many "false witnesses," in order to invalidate our succession and our orders; and when she has "found none" has resorted to so many frivolous pretences. For since there cannot be in the same place two successors of the Apostles, the admission that we have the Apostolical succession, must, on principles which they cannot but acknowledge, altogether exclude them. Hence it has been observed [1], "The objections against "the validity of the English ordinations have been "almost exclusively devised and employed by the "Romanists of England and Ireland; who having "revolted from their own Churches, resorted to every "imaginable expedient to establish their new com-"munity, *per fas et nefas*, on the ruins of the Church "of CHRIST. The Churches of the Roman communion "were in part deceived by the artifices and falsehoods "of these men; but notwithstanding the errors and "prejudice which they created, many theologians of "that communion were fully persuaded that our "ordinations were valid."

Hence also the great displeasure, which was excited by Courayer's writing his able defence of our orders. It was objected to him at the time, "it [2] "interposed an obstacle to the conversion of many "English."

The Apostolical succession then is not an abstract argument, but a tangible fact, the value of which

[1] Palmer on the Church, pt. vi. c. 10. t. ii. p. 452.

[2] Le Quien ap. Palmer, l. c. p. 451.

any plain man can feel. Any one can understand that our LORD promised to be with the Apostles and with their successors to the end of the world; nor do any other even claim to be the successors of the original Bishops of our Church, who were ordained by Apostles or Apostolic men, except those who now fill those sees, the Bishops of the Anglo-Catholic Church. The Romanist Bishops were but of yesterday, nor do they even pretend to be Bishops of our sees: they assume only to be Bishops *in partibus infidelium;* among us they are only the delegates of the Bishop of Rome. And thus they acknowledge themselves schismatics: the Romish communion in this country has, as well as the dissenters, separated itself from those who have received their Commission from the Head of the Church. To quote again the tranquil and learned writer just cited [1]. "The Romish party "in these countries committed schism in separating "from the communion of the Church, and the obe- "dience of their legitimate pastors, in the reign of "Elizabeth. It is certain, that during the reigns of "Henry VIII. and his successors, until the eleventh "year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, there were not "two separate communions and worships in England. "All the people were subject to the same pastors, "attended the same churches, and received the same "sacraments. It was only about 1570 that the "Romish party, at the instigation of foreign emis- "saries, separated itself and fell from the Catholic

[1] Palmer, pt. ii. c. 6. § 11. "The Romish Sect schismatic."

" Church of England."—" A society formed in this " manner, by voluntary separation from a Church of " CHRIST, was totally cut off from the unity of the " Catholic Church; nor is it to be alleged in reply, " that the new community was recognized by the " Roman Bishops and some of the Western Churches; " for this only proves that the Roman Bishops en- " couraged schism, and the other Churches were mis- " led by their excessive veneration for the Roman See, " and by the misrepresentations of the enemies of the " Church of England; therefore their sanction to the " new community, being given on erroneous informa- " tion, could not afford any justification of it.

" It is evident, then, that the whole separation or " schism was originated and effected by the Roman " pontiffs and their adherents, not by the Churches " among us. I repeat it, as a fact which ought never " to be forgotten, THAT WE DID NOT GO OUT FROM " THEM, but, as the Apostle says, THEY WENT OUT " FROM US, thus bearing what is, as Bossuet well " observes, the invariable mark of schism and heresy " in every age: 'Non enim nos ab illis, sed illi a " nobis recesserunt.'

" Hence it follows that the Romish communities " in England are not Churches of CHRIST; and we " have an additional proof of this in the fact, that " they were unable to show any succession of the " episcopacy in their conventicles. The Pope indeed " sent a titular bishop to them in 1625, whose suc- " cessor went to France in 1629, and returned no

" more; and up to the present time the Romish " community has not had any bishops, for although " the vicars-apostolic (as they call themselves) pre- " tend to the episcopal character, this character is by " no means essential to their office; their successors " may be priests or monks, and they have no ordi- " nary power over the English Romanists, being " merely deputies of the Roman Pontiff, who may " revoke their commissions, without any trial, at his " own will and pleasure. Consequently as vicars- " apostolic they have no episcopal jurisdiction in " England; and as titular bishops, '*in partibus infi-* " *delium*,' they have no jurisdiction any where. There- " fore they are not, properly speaking, bishops; and " the Romanists of England are devoid of any apos- " tolical succession of bishops, not to speak of some " serious difficulties which affect the validity of their " orders [1] in these countries, and which will be con- " sidered elsewhere."

" The singularity of one pastor in each place, de- " scended from the Apostles and their scholars by a " perpetual succession," to use Bp. Bilson's words, has been uniformly recognized by all Churches in the world. The only exception allowed has been where the nations speaking different languages are united in the same city, in which case each was allowed to have the blessing of a Bishop, whose

[1] The consecrations of their earlier Bishops by one Bishop, which many among themselves account invalid. Ib. pt. vi. c. xi.

language they could understand [1]. Otherwise it was a principle acknowledged by the universal Church, and formally ratified by the Council at Nice, that in one place there could be but one Bishop. "One God, One Christ, One Bishop [2]," was the exclamation of the Roman people, when the Emperor proposed to them to have two Bishops to govern the Church in common. "We are not ignorant," says Cornelius [3] to St. Cyprian, that "as there is One "God, One Christ the Lord, Whom we have con-"fessed, One Holy Spirit, so there ought to be One "Bishop in a Catholic Church." There can be but one representative of the Chief Shepherd in one place. "There [4] can be but one Bishop in a Church "at a time, and one Judge as Vicegerent of Christ." "Since [5] there can be no second after the first, who-"ever is made after him who ought to be alone, is "not a second Bishop, but is none." Whence the Martyr St. Cyprian designates such an appointment as "setting [6] up a profane altar, erecting an adulterous "chair, offering sacrilegious sacrifices against the "true Priest."

Again then, my Lord, the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, so far from having any connexion

[1] This justifies the appointment of an English Bishop in Paris.

[2] Theodoret, v. 3. quoted by Bingham, ii. 13. 6.

[3] Ep. 46. al. 49. quoted ib.

[4] Cyprian, ep. 55. al. 59. ad Cornel. quoted ib.

[5] Id. ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian, ib.

[6] Ep. 67. al. 68. ad Steph. ib.

with Romanism, is a bulwark against it. The Romanists account the promises to St. Peter to be confined to their single see; the Anglo-Catholics, with the Primitive Church, that they are inherited by the Bishops universally; Rome has in her corrupt days ever essayed to intrench on the independent authority of Bishops as of Churches; she would have them derive their authority mediately through her existing Bishop, not, together with her Bishop, from the One Bishop. The doctrine of the Apostolic succession involves our independence from the undue authority of Rome. Whatever priority of dignity there may be, the Bishop of the smallest city is as much the representative of the Chief Bishop as the Patriarch of the greatest.

But, besides this, the argument which the Romanists so frequently urge, to take "the safer side," is thus found to be on the side of our own Church. It is indeed the bounden duty of any man, in dubious cases, to take the safer side, *i. e.* that which seems more likely to have the favour of God; but the "safer side" is not with those who deny him the "Blood" of Christ, "which is shed for many for the remission of sins;" the "safer side" is not with those who forsake those whom He has appointed to succeed His Apostles in this Church, and with whom He has promised to be; the "safest side" is not with those who "form divisions among us," and whom the Apostle has given us this mark "to avoid." The "safest side" *is* that so feelingly urged by the good Bishop

Hall [1]. "Let me therefore confidently shut up all "with that resolute word of that blessed Martyr and "Saint, Ignatius—'Let all things be done to the "honour of God; give respect to your bishop, as "you would God should respect you. My soul for "their's, who obey their bishop, presbyter, and dea- "cons; God grant that my portion may be the same "with their's.'" "And let my soul," adds the pious Bishop, "have the same share with the blessed "Martyr that said so."

No, my Lord! they again little know where our Church's "great strength lies," who would have us ungratefully give up our Apostolic origin; it is a portion of God's truth; the birthright which He gave us; and whoso is ashamed of any portion of God's truth, of him will God be ashamed; our Church, if she profanely despise her birthright, may afterwards "find no place for repentance, though she seek it carefully with tears." Rome comes to us with high pretensions; true that many of them are but "art and man's device," many but the corruptions of the truth; seen by the side of the truth, the counterfeit will be evident; but if we withdraw the truth committed to us, it will pass for gold. There is much in the system of Rome to engage imaginative and ardent minds; and if the corresponding truth which we have, is hidden from sight, they will embrace it, although painfully feeling the error

[1] Episcopacy by Divine Right, conclusion.

wherewith in that Church it is mingled. We must set in array our union with the Ancient Primitive Church against their greater extent of actual Communion; the Catholicity of descent against the Pseudo-Catholicity of usurped and corrupted dominion; the Catholicity of agreement with quod semper, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique traditum est, against the Pseudo-Catholicity of modern corruptions; Apostolic succession against the claim of one universal Episcopacy; our union through continued succession with our Invisible Head, against the union with the one supposed visible head: we must show our people that all which they would seek for in Rome, they may find in the Church wherein they were baptized, if they will but study her character and avail themselves of their privileges; that it be not said of us, when too late, "felices nimium sua si bona norint!" "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace." Else will they search in the schismatic communion of Rome among us, and think that they will there find, what they had in their own Church and knew it not.

To close this subject in the words of Bishop Stillingfleet[1]:—"Three ways, Bishop Sanderson ob-
"serves, our dissenting brethren, though not in-
"tentionally and purposely, yet really and event-
"ually, have been the great promoters of the Roman
"interest among us; (1) by *putting-to their helping*
"*hand to the pulling down of Episcopacy* . . . . . .

[1] Unreasonableness of Separation; Pref. quoted Catena, No. 1. Tracts, No. 74. p. 26.

" (2) by opposing the interest of Rome with more " violence than reason ; (3) by frequently mistaking " the question, but especially through the necessity " of some false principle or other, which having once " imbibed, they think themselves bound to maintain, " whatever becomes of the common cause of our " Reformation."

I have now, my Lord, gone through all the subjects expressly treated upon in the " Tracts," which have been regarded by those of an ultra-Protestant school, as approximating to Popery ; and I have shown, I trust, that we, together with our Church, hold a distinct and tangible line, removed from modern novelties, whether of Rome or Ultra-Protestantism. In the main outlines, the views which we have put forth as those of our Church, will be familiar to your Lordship, as those of the standard Divines of our Church : we wish to set forth no new doctrines ; we would only revive what circumstances connected with the sin of 1688 have thrown into a partial oblivion ; we appeal to the formularies of our Church as interpreted by our standard Divines, and agreeing with the best and purest ages. These, as the very titles of our Tracts convey, have been the main topics, upon which we dwelt[1] : we wished to

[1] Thus the two first volumes were divided into (1) Liturgical, (2) on Ordinances, (3) on the Apostolic Succession, (4) on the Doctrine of the Church, (5) on the History of the Church, (6) Records of the Church, to which, in the first, were added some tracts explaining, (7) the Argument for the Church.

put forth no *system* of Divinity; what we wrote were "Tracts for the Times," *i. e.* on such topics as the times seemed to stand in especial need of; they were to fill up the lacunæ of a popular system, to recall to men's minds forgotten or depreciated truths, to invite them to enlarge, or correct, or modify their systems by the consideration of points upon which they had not hitherto dwelt,—"the Holy Catholic Church," (our belief of which we daily confess,) and the Ordinances of her LORD, committed to her keeping, whether His Sacraments, or rites, practices, and observances, (such as fasting, Ember days,) which she has ever observed, and which are essential to her well-being; her apostolic succession; her public prayer; her holy days and seasons; or the character of the Liturgy, in which so much of her doctrine is embodied. Occasionally, other topics have been dwelt upon, and defects have been pointed out either in the great rival system of Rome [1], or in the popular way of treating our own [2]. But the great object which runs through the whole was to bring up

[1] No. 27, 28. Bishop Cosin's History of Popish Transubstantiation; 71. on the Controversy with the Romanists; 72. Archbishop Usher's prayers for the dead, not connected with Purgatory; 79. on Purgatory.

[2] No. 73. "On the Introduction of rationalistic principles into religion," (against explaining the mysteries of the Faith, through viewing them simply as they operate upon man). No. 80. "On reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge" (against indiscriminately obtruding religious knowledge on minds unfit to receive it, "casting pearls before swine").

men's practice to the standard of their Church, AS IT IS; to remove ill-founded objections to it[1], to develope to them points, which they had not apparently considered; to realize more the system, in which we actually live, to live up to what we have.

Such was our object; and such topics (as any will have seen who has watched the nature of the attacks upon us,) have been, until very lately, the exclusive subjects of censure. The "heresy" of Baptismal regeneration, its supposed connexion with the "opus operatum" of Rome, or its variance from their view of justification; the supposed austerity of the repentance insisted on; imagined asceticism, confounded with the penance of the Church of Rome; the uncharitableness of maintaining Apostolic succession or its formality; or the high sense of the mysteriousness and sacredness of the Holy Eucharist; these were the exclusive topics of controversy.

The topics above dwelt upon are parts of the entire Catholic system; none of them stand insulated; they run into each other, and modify our faith or practice; "the Holy Catholic Church," and "the forgiveness of sins," or the "One Baptism for the remission of sins," enter among the few articles of the Creed It is obvious from the very character of the controversy which was raised, that the mode of man's justification before GOD, the character and

[1] As in No. 13. Principle of selection of Sunday Lessons; 3. on Alterations in the Liturgy; 9. and 43. on Shortening it; 22. on the Athanasian Creed, &c.

importance of the works done by and in him, repentance, future judgment, the mode of man's union with CHRIST, and His indwelling in man; the fruits of the mystery of our Blessed LORD'S Incarnation; the Communion of Saints; man's relation to His Redeemer, not as an isolated being, but as a member of "the Church, which is His Body;" the universality of Divine grace: or, to take another class, the character of Schism; the duty of submission, or independence of individual Christians; the mode of extending the influence of the Gospel; the duty of receiving articles of faith, without perceiving their bearing upon practice: these and many more are affected by the way in which the subjects thus dwelt upon are determined.

Of late, however, as the conflict has thickened, other ground has been occupied and other weapons been employed; and on these subjects also I must offer some explanation to your Lordship, premising only that these on the contrary were topics, insulated in themselves, and in no case insisted upon, or inculcated by us, but, at most, simply introduced in the course of treating upon other subjects. The two subjects to which I refer are "prayers for God's departed saints," and "celibacy." With the former of these has strangely been united, that of Invocation of the Saints, contrary to the express and careful teaching of the Tracts.

Prayers for those departed in the faith and fear of God.

I have said that this subject was mentioned by us incidentally; I would add, that in whatever degree it has been brought into notice, has been through the diligence of those who blame us, not by ourselves. "Prayers for God's departed saints," as I have already stated more at length, were, in the first instance, simply noticed historically[1], as one of the points, in which all the ancient Liturgies agreed, as also that they did in others, such as the "Kiss of Peace," and the hymn "Therefore with Angels and Archangels," &c. No stress was laid upon the fact; no observation made, except that such prayers had been "excluded from the English ritual;" (others which had just been named having been retained;) the subject of the tract in which this mention of it occurred was wholly different, on the consecration and oblation of the Holy Eucharist: there was no hint of regret at its exclusion; much less any desire of its restoration. It was, apparently, only mentioned, because from the nature of the argument it could not be avoided.

I have said this, my Lord, because I freely confess that I should myself think it inexpedient to bring forward such a topic in public discussion; it is a matter of sacred consolation to those who feel themselves justified in entertaining it; a solemn privilege

[1] Tracts, No. 63.

to the mourner; but not, after that (in consequence of abuses connected with it in the Romish system,) it had been withdrawn from our Church, to be rashly and indiscriminately revived. Those, who acknowledge it as in itself justified by primitive practice, are content that our Church has placed no restriction upon its private use by her sons; she has no where blamed it; though those once in authority in her withdrew it, (against their earlier judgment, and as matter of practical wisdom only,) from her public services. It must from its very nature be of too solemn a character, and too connected with feelings of sacred sorrow, to be gratuitously brought out of its resting-place, the hearts of those, whose friends are lost out of sight.

An opponent [1], two years past, to serve a temporary and local purpose, drew it out of the obscurity in which it lay, and, on that occasion, I showed [2] that it was neither connected with the doctrine of purgatory, nor new in the later English Church, having been justified, or employed by such Divines, as Bishop Andrews, Bull, Collier, Dean Field, (I might have added, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Taylor, and Barrow,) as well as by a living writer, who could not be accused of any Romanist tendency; that it was disconnected from Purgatory even by Bucer and

[1] The author of the "Pastoral Epistle from the Pope, to some members of the University of Oxford."

[2] Earnest Remonstrance to the author of the Pope's Pastoral Letter, &c. p. 18, sqq.

Calvin, when objecting to it, as it stood in our first reformed Liturgy. Since that time, neither in tracts, nor sermons, orally, or in writing, have we any way inculcated it; and the late publicity, which the topic has acquired, has been independent of us. We are aware that our Church does not encourage it; we are satisfied that she does not discourage it; she discourages only such prayers, as the Romanists use, which are connected with the modern doctrine of Purgatory, not those of the Primitive Church, which, as have been shown by Archbishop Usher and others, are opposed to that doctrine.

Here also, my Lord, we would contend that our Church keeps her "via media;" both Romanist and Ultra-Protestant dogmatize about the state of departed souls; the Romanist, following a natural instinct of human nature, decides that almost all souls undergo a painful purification after death, by which "Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni[1]." The Ultra-Protestant, supposing all sins to be absolutely hidden and covered by the imputation of CHRIST's righteousness, decides as peremptorily that the departed saints are already in *full* possession of the joys of heaven; he conceives of them as already "like the angels of God in heaven;" he speaks of the "joys of Heaven" as already bestowed upon them: consistently with his theory, he leaves out of

[1] Æn. vi. 742.

sight, "judgment to come" as well as the "resurrection of the body." The world, now as in Homer's time, thinks of them as ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, compassionates them as inactive, and withdrawn from *their* world, despises or forgets them. Our Church, in contrast to all these, cherishes their memory; blesses God for them [1], thinks of them as "resting in Christ [2]," and of their "spirits" as "living with God in joy and felicity [2]," yet desires "their's and "our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body "and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory [2]." She holds "all who depart hence in the Lord," to be "in peace and at rest," and this was held by the Ancient Church also, and, as being inconsistent with Purgatory, is the very point of divergence from Rome [3], she regards them as in a state of, as yet, imperfect happiness, and so differs from the Ultra-Protestant; and in both, her view coincides with the prayers of the Ancient Church, which speak of those departed as at rest, yet pray "that God would show them "mercy, and hasten the resurrection, and give a "blessed sentence in the great day." So that although, for the safety of her children, she relinquished the practice, her doctrine is in accordance with it. And certainly, it is of much importance that this should be rightly understood, for as Archbishop Usher observed, "Our Romanists do com-

[1] Prayer for the Church Militant. [2] Burial Service.

[3] Bishop Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, c. 1. sect. 4. Archbishop Usher, Answer to a Jesuit, c. 7. § 2. &c. Bishop Bull, Serm. 3. and Corruptions of the Church of Rome, t. ii. p. 260.

"monly take it for granted, that purgatory and "prayer for the dead be so closely linked together, "that the one doth necessarily imply the other." It is the wisdom of their controversialists[1] so to bind up the ancient practice with the modern corruption, that they should seem to be really blended together; it is our's to show them to be distinct; else are we enlisting man's natural and dutiful veneration for Antiquity on the side of Rome, and ourselves misleading them, and tempting them to abandon us. Those who condemn *all* prayers for CHRIST's departed servants, as Popish, are doing Rome an honour which she little deserves, and making her out in this respect to be primitive, instead of the corrupter of primitive practice.

In another point of view—if "to pray for the dead was the dictate of human nature[2]," as well as the practice of the Primitive Church—and no one, probably, who has observed himself, will doubt this—it is surely putting the members of our Church in a needlessly disadvantageous position, to teach them that our Church proscribes such prayer, that it is not to be had but in Romanism.

Why narrow thus what our Church has left undefined? why, if when our Church prays that GOD would

[1] In a recent popular book, by Dr. Rock, professing to illustrate the Romanist doctrines from monuments of ancient art, is a chapter on Purgatory; yet there is not an approximation to the doctrine of Purgatory in any one inscription cited; nothing beyond the primitive character of prayer for the departed saints.

[2] Dr. Short's Hist. of English Church, §. 15.

" give us grace so to follow their good examples, that " *with them*, we may be partakers of His heavenly " kingdom," any think that she longs for *their* " final " consummation in bliss" also, should any one seek to hinder it? or if any, understanding in a primitive sense a primitive prayer, " most humbly beseeching " Thee to grant that by the merits and Passion of Thy " Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, " we and *all Thy whole Church* may obtain remission " of our sins, and *all other benefits of His Passion*," should think that those emphatic words, "*all Thy whole Church*," were not to be restrained to the Church militant, but included that portion of the Church also, which is at rest, and prayed that they also might enjoy such " benefits of His Passion," as belonged to their state of rest, why should he be hindered[1]? Surely, both wisdom and charity require that we should not narrow our pale, nor proscribe a practice of the primitive Church, even though wisdom and charity prevent its formal restoration. A formal restoration would, in the corrupt state of modern manners, probably lower still further the standard of holiness; men would probably abuse these prayers as a ground of carnal security, and, by a worse corruption than that of Rome, look to them as available for those *not* " departed hence in the faith and fear of God." In order to have with impunity all primitive

1 So again in the Burial Service, " that we *with all those* that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation," &c.

ordinances, we must have also primitive purity and primitive discipline. To restore privileges before we restore strictness of life, were to begin at the wrong end. But our Church, as has recently been in a very elaborate sentence decided [1], condemns not *such* prayers, and why should we take upon ourselves to pronounce, where she has thought it most becoming to be silent, or restrain the liberty, which she has left unfettered?

Invocation of Saints.

There is however another subject ordinarily connected with this (though in truth not very naturally) upon which our Church has not been silent, "Invocation of the departed saints," and it is not without some amazement, even with continued experience of the carelessness of controversy, that I find it supposed that we have on this point contravened the direct teaching of our Church. I can scarcely adequately represent to your Lordship how much care was taken to prevent any mistakes upon the subject, or how strange the mis-statements which have been made. In brief, they consist, in representing us as approving that which was in the Tracts directly condemned. The case was this: on several grounds it was thought useful to translate a portion of the Breviary; such were the following [2], "to claim whatever *is good and true* "in those devotions for the Church Catholic in oppo-

[1] The office of the Judge promoted in Breeks *v.* Woolfrey, given fully in the Brit. Mag. vol. xv. p. 91.

[2] Tracts, No. 75. p. 1, 2.

" sition to the Roman Church, whose only real claim " above other Churches is that of having adopted into " the service certain additions and novelties, ascer- " tainable to be such in history, as well as being cor- " ruptions doctrinally." (2) To illustrate our own Prayer-book as being taken from it; (3) to suggest matter for our *private* devotions; (4) to " impress a " truer sense of the excellence and profitableness of " the Psalms, than it is the fashion of this age to " entertain ;" (5) by showing the corruptions to be of a later date, to add one more " fact, discriminating " and separating off the Roman from the Primitive " Church." It was observed again that " these[1] por- " tions of the Breviary" [the invocations to the Virgin and other Saints] " carry with them their own plain " condemnation in the judgment of an English Christ- " ian; no commendation of the general structure and " matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency " to reconcile him to them; and it has been the " strong feeling that this is really the case, that has " led the writer of these pages fearlessly and se- " curely to admit the real excellencies, and to dwell " upon the antiquity of the Roman ritual. He has " felt, that since the Romanists required an unquali- " fied assent to the *whole* of the Breviary, and that " there were passages, which no Anglican could " ever admit, praise *the true Catholic portion* of it as " much as he might, he did not in the slightest de-

[1] Ib. p. 8.

" gree approximate to a recommendation of Roman-
" ism." This however was not all; for after distinguishing the different parts of these corrupt additions, it was said that even those least objectionable, "*now* " do but sanction and encourage that direct worship of " the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which is the great " practical offence of the Latin Church, and *so are a* " *serious evil.*" Then it was pointed out that the oldest of these forms were the least objectionable, and were of a different kind from those now common in the Roman Church; still though "*more* could be said " *towards* their justification than for those other ad-
" dresses," they "are *now*," it was said, "a serious evil;" it was not said that they could be *justified*, much less were they recommended; it was only said that *more* could be said *towards* it; but that they were "a serious evil." Having, as it would seem, thus guarded against all possibility of mistake, the writer of this Tract proceeded to translate whole portions of the Breviary, as it stands, exhibiting together both the true Catholic portion and the Romanist additions, but referring back in almost every case to the pages of the preface in which these had been thus decidedly condemned. Now it will scarcely seem credible, my Lord, that the sole foundation for the allegation, that we "*advocate* prayers to the saints," are those very extracts from the Breviary in which they are so manifoldly condemned; that because we would "reappro-
" priate to the Catholic Church, in opposition to the " Roman Church," "the true Catholic portion" of the

Breviary, (which the Romanists have never entrusted their people with in their own tongue,) therefore it is asserted that we would reappropriate those very prayers which we distinguish from it: that when we speak of the *least* of these corruptions as a "serious evil," we would wish to "reappropriate" the *greatest* as a "treasure[1]." But neither is this the whole extent of the misrepresentation; for in another Tract in the same volume, to which the attention could not but be called, as it was expressly "on the

[1] "The 75th number of the Tracts for the Times is composed "of selections from the Romish Breviary, prepared and recom- "mended for Protestant use; in the preface to which the editor "says, 'our adversaries have in this, as in many other instances, "appropriated to themselves a treasure' [viz. 'the true Catholic "portion,' see above, p. 193] which was our's as much as their's. "The publication then of these selections is, as it were, an act of "'reappropriation.' And among these prayers thus reappropriated "to Protestant use, we find the following," [whereon follows one of the class, p. 61. which had been *expressly* designated as "a serious evil," and two others, which fell under the same class.] "Prayers "*for* the dead, and prayers *to* the Saints are both advocated" [whereon follows a hymn, of which it is yet noted in the very margin, "It is remarkable, that this hymn, which is the only one "of those here translated, which *savours of Romanism*, is the only "one, except one other, which is not known to be ancient;" so that the translator again remarks the coincidence of Romish corruption and absence of proof of antiquity], Essays, p. 289. Another writer says, "*the whole* is declared in the preface, to be a 'reappro- "priation of a treasure, which had long been lost.'" Fraser, p. 23; and yet this same writer in the next page refers to the Tract in which "invocation of the saints" is mentioned among the "chief points to be urged in controversy with Rome."

Controversy with the Romanists," "the invocation of saints" is mentioned among "the[1] practical grievances "to which Christians are subjected in the Roman "Communion, and which *should be put in the fore-* "*ground*, in this controversy." The grounds also taken in that Tract are so decided, that it may be satisfactory to transcribe what is said on this head[2].

"6. The Invocation of Saints. Here again the "*practice* should be considered, not the *theory*. Scrip- "ture speaks clearly and solemnly about Christ as "the sole Mediator. When prayer to the Saints is "recommended *at all times and places*, as ever present "guardians, and their good works pleaded in God's "sight, is not this such an infringement upon the "plain word of God, such a violation of our allegiance "to our only Saviour, as must needs be an insult to "Him? His honour He will not give to another. "Can we with a safe conscience do it? Should we act "thus in a parallel case even with an earthly friend? "Does not St. John's example warn us against falling "down before angels? Does not St. Paul warn us "against a voluntary humility and worshipping of "angels? And are not these texts *indications* of "God's will, which ought to guide our conduct? Is "it not *safest* not to pay them this extraordinary "honour? As an illustration of what I mean, I will "quote the blessing pronounced by the Pope on the "assembled people at Easter:—

[1] No. 71. p. 9. [2] Ib. p. 13, 14.

" The holy Apostles Peter and Paul, from whom has been " derived our power and authority, themselves intercede for us " to the Lord. Amen.

" For the prayers and righteous deeds of the blessed Mary, " ever Virgin, of the blessed Michael the Archangel, of the blessed " John the Baptist, of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of " all the saints, Almighty God have mercy upon you, and Jesus " Christ absolve you from all your sins, and bring you to life " everlasting. Amen.

" The Almighty and merciful Lord grant to you pardon, abso- " lution, and remission of all your sins, time for true and fruitful " penitence, an ever penitent heart, an amendment of life, the " grace and comfort of the Holy Ghost, and final perseverance in " good works. Amen.

" And the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and " the Holy Ghost, come down upon you and remain with you " always. Amen."

Thus then, my Lord, invocations of the very kind, which the authors of the Tracts are said to recommend, are instanced among the chief " practical grievances" to which Christians in the Roman communion are subjected.

All which can be said in answer is, that though all has been condemned, a distinction has been made between the older and the more recent, between a confession " in the presence of all saints" as well as of the congregation present, and a beseeching of the prayers of the " blessed Michael Archangel" and " all saints" *together* with the congregation present, and direct, *exclusive* prayers to them. None are countenanced, but it is said that the older stand on different ground. And do they not?

For since St. Paul "charged Timothy, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, *and the elect Angels*," would it be safe to pronounce a confession "in the presence of holy angels," anti-scriptural, especially when we know that "there is joy in the presence of the Angels of God over one sinner that repenteth?" Sin "gives occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme;" why should not a person, in confessing his sins, wish to take shame to himself, and to repent of and disown them, in the sight of all the holy beings whom he has shocked by them, as well as of men? Bishop Taylor, in his Golden Grove, has the following form: "Whatsoever they [my sins] are, &c. &c. "I call the whole court of heaven to witness that I "do sadly repent of them all, &c. 'Lord, be Thou "merciful to me a sinner.'" And, "I have this day "in thy sight, and in the presence of all the holy "angels that attend Thee in the conversion of a sin-"ner, made my firm resolution," &c. and "Rejoice "over me, O ye holy angels, a great part of whose "ministry it is to rejoice at the conversion of a "sinner."

So, again, with regard to the request of their prayers *together* with those of the congregation, it is obviously of a different character from prayers *exclusively* addressed to them. For the *exclusive* address of unseen beings has an obvious tendency, at once to fall into a sort of worship; it is too like the mode in which we address Almighty God, to be any way safe; the *exclusive* request of their intercessions is likely at

once to constitute them intercessors, in a way different from GOD's servants on earth, and (which is the great practical evil of these prayers in the Roman Church,) to interfere with the Office of the Great Intercessor. The union of members of the Church who are yet in the body with those unseen, is a check upon both these dangers; it brings down the application from the character of worship; it shows that both seen and unseen saints are applied to in the same way; it lays a restraint upon the mind and checks feelings, which might betray it into giving to the creature the honour due to the Creator alone. There is then surely a difference between the request, "therefore I be-" seech thee, blessed Mary, Ever Virgin, the blessed " Michael Archangel, the blessed John Baptist, the " holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all saints and *you* " *my brethren* to pray the Lord our God for me," and such a prayer as "Holy Mary, succour the wretched, " help the weak-hearted, comfort the mourners, pray " for the people, interpose for the clergy, intercede " for the devoted women; let all feel thy help whoso " celebrate thy holy commemoration," or "Holy " Mary, pray for us sinners, now and in the hour of " death," which were distinguished from it. And is not good done, by showing that the more corrupt forms came in later? So at least thought Bishop Hall [1], who makes just the same distinctions between

[1] The Old Religion, c. 14. "The newness of the Romish Invocation of Saints."

ancient and modern as were here made: "Of all "those errors which we reject in the Church of "Rome, there is none that can plead so much show "of antiquity, as this of Invocation of Saints: which "yet, *as it hath been practised and defended in the "latter times, should in vain seek either example or "patronage amongst the ancients;* however there might "be some grounds of this devotion secretly muttered, "and at last expressed in panegyrick forms, yet until "almost 500 years after Christ, it was not in any "sort admitted into the public service. It will be "easily granted that the blessed Virgin is the prime "of all saints; neither could itb e other than injuri- "ous, that any other of that heavenly society should "have the precedence of her. Now the first that "brought her name into the public devotions of the "Greek Church, is noted by Nicephorus, to be Petrus "Gnapheus, or Fullo, a Presbyter of Bithynia, after- "wards the Usurper of the See of Antioch, much "about 470 years after Christ; who (though a branded "heretick) found out four things (saith he) very use- "ful and beneficial to the Catholic Church; whereof "the last was, (Ut in omni precatione, &c.) that in "every prayer the Mother of God should be named, "and her divine name called upon.—And as for the "Latin Church, we hear no news of this Invocation, "in the public Litanies, till Gregory's time, about "some 130 years after the former.—And in the "mean time some Fathers speak of it fearfully and "doubtfully. Others of the Fathers have let fall

" speeches directly bent against this Invocation.—
" And those of the Ancients, that seem to speak for
" it, lay grounds that overthrow it: *however it be, all*
" *holy Antiquity would have both blushed and spit at*
" *those forms of Invocation, which the late Clients of*
" *Rome have broached to the world;* if perhaps they
" speak to the Saints tanquam deprecatores, (vel
" potius comprecatores) as Spalatensis yields; mov-
" ing them to be competitioners with us to the throne
" of grace, not properly, but improperly, as Altissio-
" dore construes it: how would they have digested
" that blasphemous Psalter of our Lady, imputed to
" Bonaventure, and those styles of mere Deification
" which are given to her: and the division of all
" offices of piety to mankind, betwixt the Mother
" and the Son? How had their ears glowed to hear,
" Christus oravit, Franciscus exoravit, Christ prayed,
" Francis prevailed? How would they have brooked
" that which Ludovicus Vives freely confesses, Multi
" Christiani, &c. Many Christians worship (divos
" divasque) the Saints of both sexes, no otherwise
" than God Himself? Or that which Spalatensis
" professes to have observed, that the ignorant multi-
" tude are carried with more entire religious affection
" to the blessed Virgin, or some other Saint, than to
" Christ their Saviour? These foul superstitions are
" not more heinous than new, and such, as wherein
" we have justly abhorred to take part with the prac-
" tisers of them."

But there is probably here also not mere miscon-

ception, but a real difference of habit of mind and feeling between the three views. Romanist and Ultra-Protestant are alike rigorous in opposite ways. The Romanist is not content with the persuasion that Christ's departed servants, being admitted near the Presence, and under the shadow of the throne of glory, and by the heavenly Altar [1], continue the intercessions for the Church here below, which they offered while in the body; he will not rest satisfied in the assurance of God's good will to us herein; he must fain obtain to himself a personal interest in their intercessions, appropriate them to himself, make them personally his friends, and so he steps beyond Antiquity, and asks them directly to intercede for him, prays to them, makes them his Intercessors, approaches to GOD and CHRIST through them, instead of casting himself directly upon GOD'S mercy in CHRIST; at last, in practice, substitutes them as Intercessors for the One Intercessor. He begins by laying down that it is "good [2] and useful *suppliantly* "*to invoke them*, and *to flee to their prayers, aid, and* "*help* to obtain benefits from God through His Son "Jesus Christ our Lord, Who Alone is our Redeemer "and Saviour," and condemns as "*impious*, those who "deny that they are to be invoked, or assert that "the invocation of them to pray for each of us *in-*"*dividually*, is idolatry;" he ends by making them his

[1] Rev. vi. 9.

[2] Conc. Trid. Sess. 25, de invocat. venerat. et reliquiis Sanctorum et sacris imaginibus.

mediators, as beings more like himself, whom he can approach with less of awe, with less earnest resolutions of holiness, less anxiety about his sins, in his own words, as "meek and mild [1]," and not as a "consuming fire." The Ultra-Protestant, revolted at this abuse, will not hear of their interceding at all, proscribes all thought of it, cuts himself off—not from their communion and fellowship, but from all sense of it and its blessedness; will be thankful for the prayers of weak sinners like himself, but will not feel the privilege of their prayers who are "delivered from "the burden of the flesh, and the miseries of this sin-"ful world," and in the abodes of love, love us more holily; is jealous of every mention of them, and so forgets them; and either restrains the doctrine of the "Communion of Saints" to the charities of this life, or makes it a mere abstract statement that all the redeemed belong to one body. Our Church, between

[1] "Only we shall recite a few words of Antoninus, their great "Divine and Archbishop of Florence; 'it is necessary that they, "to whom she converts her eyes, being an advocate for them, "shall be justified and saved.' And whereas it may be objected "out of John that the Apostle says, 'If any man sin, we have an "Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,' he an-"swers 'that Christ is not our Advocate alone but our Judge; "and since the just is scarce secure, how shall a sinner go to Him "as to an Advocate? Therefore God hath provided us an advo-"catess, who is gentle and sweet, in whom nothing that is sharp "is to be found.'" Bp. Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, c. 2. sect. 8; compare Mr. Froude's observations founded on their actual practice, Remains, t. i p. 294. quoted Appendix, No. 91.

both, recognizes with the ancient church, the actualness of the Communion of Saints; that "God[1] has "knit together His elect in one communion and fel- "lowship, in the mystical body of His Son, Christ "our Lord;" it rejoices in God's assurance[2], that through "the due receiving of the holy mysteries," "we are very members incorporate in the *mystical* "body of His Son, which is the blessed company of "all faithful people," and prays, that we may "continue in that holy fellowship;" weekly "blesses[3] His "Holy Name for all His servants departed this life "in His faith and fear;" accompanies their departure from this life, with "hearty[4] thanks that it hath "pleased Him to deliver them out of the miseries of "this sinful world;" prays God that His "holy An- "gels[5] may, by His appointment, succour and de- "fend us on earth;" but there stops short, is content to feel the blessedness of that mystical union, and with the assurance that it must be a blessing, without intruding into that holy fellowship with selfish and unauthorized prayers to them to intercede for us individually, or approaching them with language which if they hear it, must be shocking to them, as belonging rather to their Lord.

We may then have a vivid and thankful sense of

[1] Collect for All Saints' Day.

[2] Thanksgiving after Communion.

[3] Prayer for the Church Militant.

[4] Burial Service.

[5] Collect for St. Michael and All Angels.

our privilege of belonging to a body, part of whom have passed through our trials, tribulations, and infirmities, and "have been brought out of great tribu- "lation, and washed their robes in the Blood of the "Lamb;" we may take comfort that they, together with their Lord, sympathize with the imperfect members of His body, and intercede for us before Him, with greater purity than our earthly friends; we might think of it with respectful affection and gratitude; we might thank GOD for it; we might even pray Him, that they might intercede as for us, without even approximating to the errors of the Church of Rome. In a word, we might be thankful that they do intercede for us, without making them our intercessors or praying them so to do. In Origen's beautiful language [1], "nor doth the High Priest alone pray "with those who pray truly, but the 'angels' also 'in "heaven' who 'rejoice over one sinner that repenteth "more than over ninety and nine just persons, who "need no repentance,' and the souls of the saints who "fell asleep before us:—For whereas in this life "knowledge is manifested to those accounted worthy, "'through a glass, darkly,' but then revealed 'face to "face,' it were inconsistent if the like were not "to be the case as to other excellencies, especially "since what is laid up beforehand in this life is then "really perfected. But one of the chiefest excellen- "cies, according to the divine word, is love of our "neighbour, which the saints, who have fallen asleep

[1] De Orat. § 11. t. i. p. 213, 14. ed. de la Rue.

" before us, must necessarily be supposed to have
" much more exceedingly towards those who are yet
" engaged in the strife of this life, than those who are
" yet beset with human infirmity, and but helping the
" weaker in a common strife. Not here alone does
" brotherly love fulfil that saying, 'if one member suf-
" fer, all the members suffer with it, and if one mem-
" ber be honoured, all the members rejoice with it.'
" For it beseemeth well the love of those who have
" departed this present life, to say 'the care of all
" the Churches;—who is weak, and I am not weak?
" who is offended, and I burn not?' and the more,
" when Christ professeth that He is sick in each of
" the sick saints; and in like way, that He is in
" prison also, and naked, and both a stranger and
" hungered and a-thirst; for who of those who read
" the Gospel knoweth not that Christ, ascribing to
" Himself the things which befal believers, account-
" eth them as His own sufferings? And if the angels
" of God, coming to Jesus, minister to Him, and it
" were not fitting to conceive of this ministry of the
" angels about Jesus, as restricted to the brief period
" of his bodily sojourn among men, when He was
" among believers, 'not as he that sitteth at meat,
" but as he that serveth,' how many angels, think
" you, minister to Jesus, Who willeth to bring toge-
" ther the children of Israel one by one, and collect
" them from the dispersion, and saveth those who fear
" and call upon Him!—for not in vain do 'the angels
" of God ascend and descend upon the Son of man,'

" being seen by the eyes enlightened by the light of " true knowledge; yea, the angel of each, even of " the 'little ones' in the Church, 'always beholding " the face of the Father Who is in heaven,' and con- " templating the divinity of Him who created us, " prayeth together with us, and worketh together in " such things which we pray for, as admit thereof."

I have dwelt upon this topic, because some of the *more* ancient forms which have been objected to, *may* express nothing more than this consciousness, that the saints at rest do pray for us, and so help us by their prayers. The words "*intercedentibus omnibus sanctis*," *need* mean no more than this; nor *need* the words " whose [1] deeds of grace working together with our prayers," mean more than St. Paul means, when he says [2], " I fill up that which is behind of " the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for His body's " sake which is the Church." Practically, what was said more than excluded the use of any of these forms; they were spoken of as, practically, " a serious evil;" yet it is wise, as well as charitable, not to interpret what *may* be innocent, by later usages which are not so, nor to do Rome the service of carrying up her corruptions into ages which knew not of them, by putting the same glosses upon their words which she would. The liability of their being misunderstood should preclude our using them; yet ought we not ourselves to misunderstand or misinterpret them.

[1] Essays, p. 289. [2] Col. i. 24.

Celibacy.

There yet remains one specific charge, which is to prove an inclination towards the Romanist system, the praise of celibacy. It is urged as an objection, that we do not put forward "the celibacy of the clergy," among "the chief grounds of difference between ourselves and the Church of Rome," and that "Monasticism and celibacy are counselled and recommended in some passages." At the same time it is admitted that these passages cannot be altogether adduced as speaking our sentiments, inasmuch as "several of" us "are married clergymen [1]."

And first, I may state to your Lordship, that no where in the Tracts have there been put forth any recommendations whether of celibacy in general, or that of the Clergy in particular. It has not been inculcated, nor even been named in the Tracts; and what has been elsewhere said by any who have written in the Tracts, has been dropped incidentally; there has been nothing of systematic promotion of this state. Then, also, when mentioned, it has been with reference to specific cases, to provide for especial needs [2], such as where St. Paul says "on account of

[1] Essays, p. 291, 2.

[2] The passages quoted are Brit. Mag. vol. ix. p. 366. "You "must have dissent or monachism in a Christian country: so make "your choice." Ib. p. 368. "Great towns will never be evange- "lized merely by the parochial system; *they are beyond the sphere* "*of the parish priest*, burdened as he is with the endearments and "anxieties of a family." Froude's Remains, t. i. p. 322. "It has

the present distress;" or as a way more excellent in itself, as one of the triumphs of Faith, not as being generally expedient or desirable, even among the clergy. And herein, at once a distinction is made between the teaching of these writers and that of the Church of Rome, which absolutely requires it of her priests; and it appears also how far they are from advocating views in a proselytizing, or party spirit.

With regard to the subject itself, I may perhaps the less scruple to speak, as belonging to that class, who, it is admitted, from the circumstances of their own life, cannot be disposed either to underrate the blessings of marriage, or unduly to exalt the celibate. I own then, my Lord, I cannot read such passages, as, "There be eunuchs, which have made themselves "eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake; he that "is able to receive it, let him receive it." "Verily, "I say unto you, that there is no man who hath left "father or mother, or wife or children for My Name's "sake, but he shall receive manifold more in this "present life, and in the world to come life everlasting." "He that standeth steadfast in his heart, "having no necessity, but hath power over his own

"lately come into my head that the *present state* of things in Eng-"land makes an opening for reviving the monastic system." He continued; "I think of putting the view forward under the title "of 'Project for reviving religion in great towns.' Certainly, "colleges of unmarried priests, (who *might* of course *retire to a* "*living*, *when they* could, *and liked*) would be the cheapest possible "way of *providing for the spiritual* wants of a large population."

" will, and hath so decreed in his heart, that he will " keep his virgin, doeth well; so then he that giveth " her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her " not in marriage doeth better."—I cannot read these and others without acknowledging, that, though marriage is not permitted only, but " honourable," yea, our LORD honoured the marriage rite by His Presence and by His beginning of miracles, and has consecrated it into a mystery and an image of the Church's union with Him, still " a more excellent way " is pointed out to " those, to whom it is given." Marriage has not only safety, but honour. Changed as its character is by the fall, in that it now gives birth to a tainted offspring, yet, that men might not despise it, and thence make a snare to themselves, GOD has restored it to a portion of the dignity which it had from His institution in Paradise, dignified it in the Patriarchs, set forth an example of it in " Abraham His friend," and in the pure blessings of Isaac, made its mutual love a similitude of that which He bears to His Church, and of her reverence to Him, her Head and Saviour; hallowed it yet more, in that His Son was born of the seed of David, according to the flesh, though not after the flesh, and His Ever-Virgin Mother was betrothed, when He " abhorred not the Virgin's womb," and He appointed that mothers should be " saved by the Childbearing;" He takes us by the hand, and hallows our union by the blessing of His Church; so that what man might have feared to approach, is, when " enterprised reverently, dis-

creetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God," a continual image and representation of things holy and Divine.

But it is the very character of the Faith, that, while it ennobles the use of GOD's permitted blessing, it points out to those who can receive it, a higher way, by foregoing them. Thus, it declares "every "creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, "if it be received with thanksgiving," and it consecrates it to our use "by the word of God and by Prayer," yet it shows "a more excellent way" by fasting, which "He who seeth in secret, shall reward "openly:" it teaches that "our lands are in our own "power;" yet it promises "manifold more to those "who forsake houses and lands for His Name's sake "and the Gospel's:" it teaches to "lie down in "peace and sleep in Him, Who maketh us to dwell "in safety," yet those who are able, it invites to be like their LORD, and "watch unto prayer," to "prevent "the night watches," or even to "spend the night in "prayer to God:" it teaches to "use this world with-"out abusing it," yet is St. Paul's example higher, who lived "crucified with his Saviour to the world and the world to him:" it sheds a grace and beauty around life's innocent enjoyments, and teaches us a Christian mirthfulness, yet it points, as the higher and nobler, to "take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in *necessi-*"*ties*, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake[1],"

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 10.

in St. Paul's eight-fold "perils;" "in weariness and "painfulness, in hunger and thirst, in cold and naked-"ness[1];" it invests with a sacred awe "magistrates and those who are in authority," yet bids those "who would be chief among" us, "to be as the servants of all;" it sanctifies marriage, but it places above it those who forego wives for His sake.

But what has this, my Lord, in common with Rome and Romanism? The preference of celibacy, as the higher state, is Scriptural, and as being such, is Primitive. The corruption of Rome was not its *preference*, but its tyrannical and ensnaring and avaricious *enforcement;* it was in forcing (in the middle ages) the Clergy to separate from their wives, and, against the law of God, "putting those asunder, whom God had joined;" and this for her own aggrandizement, to make the Clergy more dependent upon herself; it was in conniving with the pride of parents, and entangling the reluctant daughters of the great with vows of celibacy, in order to obtain their dowry for her convents; it is in enforcing a rigid rule of singleness upon all her clergy, and drawing them into it before they know their own strength or weakness; it is in preferring the risk of their salvation to the risk of her own power, and casting them ruthlessly into temptation, without regard to the weak, rather than abandon a rule, which binds them all, though with an iron band, to herself. And thus that corrupt Church

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 26, 27.

has, in the minds of the undistinguishing, cast a reproach over that which Scripture points out as the more excellent, and tainted it with her pride, and avarice, and lust of power.

But why should men thus in their haste leap over to the contrary side, and exercise a tyranny over men's consciences in the opposite way? Why thus decry and revile as Popish what is Primitive? Why should not celibacy be used by those to whom it is given, to bind men's affections the more firmly to their LORD, instead of to Rome? Scripture says[1], "He that is "unmarried careth for the things that belong unto "the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he "that is married careth for the things of the world, "how he may please his wife." Why then cut off the aspirings of those more ardent minds, who hope thus to wait upon their LORD without distraction? Why not be thankful for our own blessings, without grudging to those who have foregone them for their LORD's sake, the blessing annexed to self-denial, that they might "give themselves," the rather, "wholly to these things," and to the service of their LORD? Why not content ourselves to be among those who have

"Love's supporting force
To cheat the toil and cheer the way;"

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33.

without envying others

> " in their lonely course,
> (Lonely not forlorn [1].)"—

Why, as Rome has tried, and in vain, to stretch out the limbs of her clergy to one uniform standard, should people among us use the other half of the ancient tyrant's cruelty, and setting up a lower standard, amputate all, which exceeds it? This forced mediocrity of attainment is unsafe as it is cruel; it provides no vent for those, who can find no rest in the ordinary and even paths of life; it drives such into Romanism, or makes them founders of fresh schisms among ourselves. A more generous course, which would have interposed, when necessary, the guidance of authority, and led but not inhibited, might have made Wesley and Whitfield useful members of the Church, instead of leaving them to plunge thousands into schism, and to train off into a delusive doctrine many of the best members of our Church. I am not advocating celibacy, my Lord, as the general rule of the Church, nor imposing upon others " a yoke, which I touch not with one of my fingers:" nor have any of us so done. But surely there is room for all; and while the peaceful duties of the country-pastor, can often be even better discharged, perhaps, by a married priest, " ruling [2] well his own house,

[1] Christian Year, Feast of St. John the Evangelist.

[2] Marriage Service.

and having his children in subjection in all gravity[1]," a pattern of domestic charities, there are surely duties enough in the Church, where celibacy may have its proper place, and where there is much room for the exhibition of the sterner grace of self-denial, foregoing all the highest earthly joys, which cheer us on our pilgrimage, passing alone and isolated through the world, and *visibly* living only for his Master's work, and to gather in his Master's scattered sheep. If the degraded population of many of our great towns are to be recovered from the state of Heathenism in which they are sunk, it must be by such preaching of the cross, wherein it shall be forced upon man's dull senses, that they who preach it have forsaken all, to take it up and bear it after their LORD. They must, like St. Paul, "bear about in their bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus," the prints of His nails, and the piercing of His side. The preacher of repentance did not go forth "in soft clothing," or "living delicately," or encompassed with the joys of life; and if we, as we much need, are to have men "in the spirit and power of Elias, before the great and terrible day of the Lord," the very circumstances of their lives must correspond with and declare the earnestness of their message, and that they have left all to bear it. There is need and room for soldiers of all sorts in the LORD's "willing army;" why cut off any one kind? why require that

[1] 1 Tim. iii. 4.

all His warriors should "cumber themselves with the concerns of this life?" why should not some undertake a harder, so that it be, which in the Church of Rome it is not, a "willing service?" Why again should the daughters of our land be in a manner forced into marriage, as in the former days of Romanism they were into celibacy, and the days of the Old Testament be brought back upon us, and our maidens marry, in order to "take away their reproach among men," now that He who was looked for is come, and they can serve Him, not by becoming mothers of the holy line whereof He was born, but by ministering to His members in a sanctified Virgin-estate? Why should we not also, instead of our desultory visiting-Societies, have our *Sœurs de la Charité*, whose spotless and religious purity might be their passport amid the scenes of misery and loathsomeness, carrying that awe about them, which even sin feels towards undefiledness, and impressing a healthful sense of shame upon guilt by their very presence? Why should marriage alone have its duties among the daughters of our great, and the single estate be condemned to an unwilling listlessness, or left to seek undirected, and unauthorized, and unsanctified, ways of usefulness of its own?

Here, also, again, our Church, my Lord, preserves her equable moderation, not enforcing celibacy, with the Romanist, nor despising it, with the world, nor dishonouring it, with the Ultra-Protestant, as having

no acceptableness nor excellency, but holding it forth as the result of a "gift" of God, to be observed and retained by those upon whom He has bestowed it, as being His gift, but not, of necessity, to be imposed upon or required of any. Only in this, as in other actions of life, she would not have us act, as altogether our own masters, but as having to give account of the gifts which we have received; she does not recommend her Clergy to marry, but only holds it "*lawful*" for them "as for all other Christian men;" nor regards it as a matter of course (as is the case now-a-days), but as a matter of earnest consideration; to be done or abstained from, "at their own discretion, *as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness*[1]."

Such, my Lord, are all the topics[2], which an anxious, though not, I must think, an enlightened jealousy for the purity of our Church has collected together, whereon to found its warning against what it, from its point of view, must consider as an approximation to Romanism. There has indeed been not a little carelessness in these charges even among those who appear to have taken most pains[3], partly from a natural inability to understand a system, which was new to them, partly from an impatience not unnatural, at being disturbed in the quiet possession of one, which had become extensively popular, which they had accustomed themselves to consider as a

[1] Art. xxxii. [2] See Preface, Edit. 4. [3] Essays on the Church.

proof of the greater spirituality and enlightenment of the present age, and to contrast with the darkness of early times. They had, too, been wont to declaim in a popular way against Popery, without giving themselves much pains to understand its true character, or whether their own ground were tenable against it; their disappointment at the abandonment of any such positions is much the same as was felt by the Romanists at Courayer's defence of our orders; it takes out of their hands a convenient weapon, and they feel that they must look out for another, or at least their grasp of this seems less secure than before. Then, also, they do not understand the relation which our Church really holds to that of Rome; there seems to lurk at the bottom some suspicion that we set up a new Church at the Reformation, instead of merely purifying our ancient one; that we separated ourselves from Rome, instead of simply denying the undue authority of her bishop over us; that we "went out from" her, and are responsible for so doing, that we must have reasons, to show why we do not return to her. Not holding the doctrine of the Apostolical succession, they do not realize to themselves our position as an independent Church, that even independently of the question of our relative purity, we have no more occasion to go over to them than they to us; that individuals among us are bound to remain in the Church, through whose ministry they have been made members of CHRIST. They have not been accustomed to apply the argument to dissent, much

less can they to Romanism, which comes with so much more of system; nay, they have in many cases disabled themselves from so doing by acting on a contrary principle towards other Churches; they have not been taught that affectionateness to their own Mother, which should instinctively hold them by her side; they have not learned to regard their Bishops as the representatives of the Apostles, and to cleave to them as the centres of unity; and so they must needs have some strong, hard arguments to satisfy themselves. Any diminution of these unsettles them, as having built on no solid foundation, except a general and sometimes exaggerated notion of the corruptions which Rome has actually and formerly sanctioned. Hence one who cannot see that Rome is *the* Antichrist, seems to them to betray them into its hands.

And not only so, but even the very selection of certain topics for our controversy with Rome, has been thought to involve the abandonment of the rest. It so happened that the same writer, in two distinct places, recommended to take practical grounds, leaving abstract arguments, or subjects which (as Transubstantiation) cannot be discussed without pain. Two independent opponents fell in, the one with the one essay in which seven such subjects were named, the other, writing against the Tracts, had not read this Tract, though expressly "on the controversy "with Rome;" but another in which four only were selected for illustration; both, however, came to the same conclusion, that because only four or seven

happened to be put forward, therefore on all other points we hold with Rome. The argument certainly proves too much, unless seven and four are the same; and it is somewhat characteristic of this hasty proceeding, that one of the Tracts[1] of the first year took up the same *fourteen* points, upon which Bishop Hall insists in "The Old Religion," as "*some* of our *irre-*" *concileable* differences with Rome as she is," and having so done, adds, "I might add other points in " which also I protest against the Church of Rome, " but I think it enough to make my confession in " Hall's order, and so leave it."

On the same ground, any concession that Rome is a true Church, is to them equivalent to saying that we should return under her shadow, forgetting what Bishop Hall states as the common sentiment of Divines, though in his days also it brought much declamation against him from Ultra-Protestants. " That which Rome holds with us, makes it a Church: " That which it obtrudes upon us, makes it heretical; " the truth of principles makes it one, the error and " impiety of additions makes it irreconcileable, &c. " Look on the face therefore of the Roman Church, " she is ours, she is God's. Look on her back, she " is quite contrary, Antichristian: More plainly, " Rome doth both hold the foundation, and destroy " it; she holds it directly, destroys it by consequent; " In that she holds it she is a true Church, howsoever

[1] No. 38. p. 11. The passage is given in the Appendix, No. 14.

" impured; In that she destroys it, (what semblance " soever she makes) she is a Church of malignants. " If she did not altogether hold it, she should be " either no Church, or devilish, but now that she " professes to hold those things directly which by " inferences she closely overthrows, she is a truly " visible Church, but an unsound one [1]."

When the time of trial shall come, it will be seen which principles most favour Rome, the Catholic or the Ultra-Protestant [2]. We have seen those in our own Church, who having held extreme Ultra-Protestant notions, have become converts to Rome, of whom she has much boasted. " Excuse me," says Archbishop Bramhall [3], "for telling the truth plainly; many " who have had their education among Sectaries and " Non-conformists have apostated to Rome, but few " or no right Episcopal Divines. *Hot water freezeth* " *the soonest.*" " Unthinking people," says Bishop Sanderson [4], ... " are carried away with mere noise and " pretences, and hope these will secure them against " the fears of Popery, who talk with most passion,

[1] Advertisement prefixed to the Reconciler: an Epistle pacificatory of the seeming differences of opinion concerning the trueness and visibility of the Roman Church.

[2] In Scotland no member of the Church has fallen off to Romanism or any of the heresies which have distracted it; in Edinburgh alone, the Romanists boast of 100 converts from Presbyterianism yearly.

[3] Vindication of Grotius, Disc. 3, quoted Catena Tracts, lxxiv. p. 14.

[4] Unreasonableness of Separation, Pref. quoted ib. p. 25.

" and with least understanding against it; whereas
" no persons do really give them greater advantages
" than these do. For, where they meet only with
" intemperate railings, and gross misunderstandings
" of the state of the controversies between them and
" us (which commonly go together), the most subtle
" priests let such alone to spend their rage and fury;
" and when the heat is over, they will calmly en-
" deavour to let them see how grossly they have
" been deceived in some things, and so will more
" easily make them believe, they are as much de-
" ceived in all the rest. And thus the East and
" West may meet at last, and the most furious
" antagonists may become some of the easiest con-
" verts. This I do really fear will be the case of
" many thousands among us, who now pass for most
" zealous Protestants; if ever, which God forbid, that
" religion should come to be uppermost in England.
" It is, therefore, of mighty consequence for prevent-
" ing the return of Popery, that men rightly under-
" stand what it is. For, when they are as much
" afraid of an innocent ceremony as of real idolatry,
" and think they can worship images and adore the
" Host on the same grounds that they may use the
" sign of the Cross, or kneel at the Communion,
" when they are brought to see their mistake in one
" case, they will suspect themselves deceived in the
" other also. . . . . *When they find undoubted practices*
" *of the Ancient Church condemned as Popish and*
" *Antichristian by their teachers, they must conclude*

" *Popery to be of much greater antiquity than really*
" *it is; and when they can trace it so very near the*
" *Apostles' times, they will soon believe it settled by*
" *the Apostles themselves.* For it will be very hard
" to persuade any considering men, that the Christian
" Church should degenerate so soon, so unanimously,
" so universally, as it must do, if Episcopal govern-
" ment, and the use of some significant ceremonies,
" were any parts of that apostacy."

I have now, I trust, said enough, my Lord, to allay in some degree the strange alarms, which seem to have almost scared people " from their propriety." In this alarm it is not strange that their fears should have been increased by the compliments bestowed by Romanists upon what we have put forth as the Anglican system. In some Romanists, this may have been sincere, for if they can find Romanism in Antiquity, as easily of course may they find it in the Anglican system, which wishes to be a faithful representative of Antiquity; or if Ultra-Protestants think what we are persuaded is the system of our Church an approximation to Romanism, so may the Romanists, as contrasted with Ultra-Protestantism; and those who accuse us of a Romanist tendency, are, of course, animating them to more vigorous efforts against our Church, by holding out these delusive prospects of co-operation within her own camp. These may be sincere, for not many years past, when on the establishment of the new university at Bonn, a place of worship was set apart for the Lutherans, some Romanists

expressed to an eminent Lutheran theologian, their joy, that they were returning to the bosom of the true Church. The ground of this hope was that they had regular, though not daily, service, which they had not before. The Romanist regards all Church-order as belonging to him, disorder to those not in communion with his Church; and so, any increase of order seems to him a return to *his* Church; as in truth, a Church which has daily service, and weekly Communions, has something in common with *his* Church, which a body that neglects these has not; but only so far in common, as she agrees with Antiquity; for our Church, if she realize her weekly communions, has a privilege which, in that of Rome, the laity have not, nor a daily service in a language which they understand.

But though some, especially the Romanist Laity, may be really misled, charity cannot suppose that those who are versed in the controversy between their Church and our's, are sincere in their congratulations on this revival of Catholic truth, which had slept among us. They know too well who are their true foes; they even, now and then [1], let some signs of annoyance escape them, in the very midst of their assumed ease and joy, like the Spartan boy, whose entrails the stolen fox was gnawing; they feel that their own game is being spoiled; they had hoped to come upon us unprepared, or armed with Ultra-Pro-

[1] In the Dublin Review.

testant weapons, which had never been proved in any real conflict; and they are mortified at seeing us donning the ancient armour, which has stood proof against them in many a conflict, and which they have never been able to pierce. They had hoped, by aid of what is really ancient in their system, to bring back among us their own modern corruptions; by aid of what is Catholic to introduce what is peculiar to Rome: they are annoyed at finding the posts pre-occupied, that members of our Church are conscious of her position, that she possesses stored up for her children every thing which they could hold out as an inducement to them to fall away to Rome. And so they have resorted to the corrupt policy which they practised of old against our Church, and would make men suspicious of the truth, as independent of their corruptions, knowing that if the truth be removed, men must fall sooner or later to their errors. If they can but bring our people out of the straight path, they doubt not that they must fall into their nets; if they but set them against the pure truth, they must receive it drugged with other ingredients. Rome has enough of truth to prevail every where, except against Catholic truth itself; it has been gaining upon the bodies which have severed themselves from our Church; it knows well what are weak defences and what are strong; it would draw us out of our strong-holds, and taunt us to abandon them and make us suspicious of them, as if they belonged to her. "It[1] is a matter of history,

[1] Crosthwaite, Sermons on the Christian Ministry and the

" that some of the first and most active promoters of " Puritanism, and afterwards of Non-conformity, were " Roman Catholic priests, who received orders, or pre- " tended to receive orders in our Church, that in the " disguise of friends they might more effectually dis- " turb and smite it. These men did not dare to broach " the peculiar tenets of their Church, but they endea- " voured to disunite and decompose the fabric of our " unity by infusing doubts and scruples; by decrying " the Ecclesiastical discipline of our Church as an in- " fringement of Christian liberty; by objecting to our " Liturgy and Cathedral service as formal and popish; " by making their hearers to join in more spiritual and " exciting devotions; and thus they gradually paved " the way for actual separation and dissent, and for all " the calamities which fell upon our country, and from " which we have never yet recovered. There is also " positive proof, that for a very considerable period, " Jesuits were regularly educated on the continent, " and sent over to these countries to enter into the " ministry, not only of our Church, but of every sect " in the nation."—Rome is unchanged; only her task has become easier, since she then had to set people against what were the acknowledged tenets of the Church, and to stir up men's minds to disaffection against their Church; now our Church is divided

Establishment of Christianity, p. 124. In the Appendix, Note B. p. 143 sqq. is much curious evidence carefully brought together on the part which disguised Romanists took in preaching up Puritanism and declaiming against the Church as Popish.

against herself, and a large portion of her sons and ministers have unlearnt in some respects the teaching of their Church, and are ready to disown it. But the line taken by Rome is the same. As her emissaries then declaimed against the use of the cross, "the service of the Church," "the communion table placed altar-ways" as Popish, so now would she create a suspicion against those who vindicate the ancient meaning of that service, and who speak of the "altar" or the "cross," as if such belonged to her; and they who have much in their mouths the craftiness and subtlety of Rome, are simple enough to suppose that she would thus lay open her own movements, and set people on their guard against those who were preparing the way for her. No, my Lord! those who are really doing her work, she allows to work on in peace; and by aid of the daily press, labours to spread their opinions, and to identify them with the system of our Church; so shall she, she well knows, gain an easy victory! She can afford to have Rome evil spoken of, if but the true Anglican system be disparaged also. It is but the exchange of the fable, the wolf-cubs for the shepherd-dogs.

"It[1] was again replied, yourselves have preached "so much against Rome and his holiness, that Rome "and her Romanists will be little the better for that "change; but it was answered, you shall have mass "sufficient for 100,000 in a short space, and the

[1] Romanist Consultations, in letter of Archbishop Bramhall, ib. p. 156.

" governors never the wiser." Let Rome but undermine the credit of the English doctrines as papistical, and she would have no difficulty in erecting her own upon the ruins. For the mind yearns toward the truth, and cannot wander about for ever, not knowing where to rest the sole of its foot; if she misses a " sure resting-place," she will afterwards take up with whatever seems least likely to betray her footing; if she miss of truth in its purest and most awful form, she will afterwards be too glad to embrace it, amid whatever corruptions she may find it.

But we feel confident that it will not be so among us; the cloud of suspicion that now lowers about us will, with a little patience, disperse; it is a good omen that we are attacked by the same who are joined in an unnatural union against our Church, Romanist and Dissenter and Latitudinarian; and if to these are, for the present, added many well-meaning members of our own Church, yet this has its origin in some natural misconception only, and will subside of itself, when they see our meaning more fully. Their prejudice lies not against the truths which we hold, but against certain consequences thought to be derived from them, or a negative way, in which they were in the last century held by many; or they see not how to reconcile them with other truths which are indisputable, or with tenets which they have been taught to think so; or they fear their effects on holiness of life; or they know not how to distinguish them from Romish cor-

ruptions of them; or they may be deterred by what of human infirmity may have cleaved to our statements. These and the like take time to remove.

But their fears will subside, and that the sooner, I doubt not, for the very extravagance of this temporary panic; and they who have been the most alarmed at the picture which periodicals have drawn of the principles put forward by us in the name of our Church, will embrace them the most fully when they learn their real character. They fear not our principles or practices, but principles or practices which we also should fear as well as they, and which have been given out for our's; they dread not the effects of our principles, but effects, which they have been led to associate with them, and which we should deprecate as truly; and when they see that veneration for Antiquity can be combined with thankfulness for the purity of our own Church [1]; that our views on Justification lead men of themselves to cast them on their Redeemer, justifying them freely, and keeping them justified by His Spirit, forgiving them freely, and crowning freely His own gifts in them; that our statements of sin after Baptism lead them the rather to His fulness of mercy, and amid acts of self-abasement, or self-chastening, or charity, to look not to these acts but to Him, to seek for their peace at His hand, whether directly or through the Ordinances of the Church, not from themselves, or from their works;

[1] See Index to Appendix, v. Anglo-Catholics, and Tract, No. 86.

that our views on the Sacraments tend to humble the Priest [1], while they exalt the Priestly Office, and teach men not to rest on any *opus operatum*, but to guard and keep themselves the more diligently, because God has deigned so to sanctify them; that the doctrine of the Apostolical succession tends to order and submissiveness within, and promotes charity and compassion for those without;—they will, we doubt not, examine the teaching of their Church more dispassionately than hitherto, and find it, in the main outline, to be what we have declared it.

Already an earnest of this has been given; and

[1] The Confessions of the Priests in the ancient Liturgies, previous to the celebration of Divine Offices, imply very deep humiliation. It is only the corruptions of the Church of Rome, which tend to infuse spiritual pride into the priesthood; the true doctrine humbles him. The following is the beginning of a confession in the Euchologion, to be said by the Priest for himself in the Baptismal Service. (Assem. Cod. Lit. t. ii. p. 133, 4.)

"O compassionate and merciful God, who searchest the heart "and reins, and Alone knowest the secrets of men, there is "nothing hidden from Thee, but all things are naked and open to "Thine eyes. Thou who knowest all of me, cast me not away, nor "turn Thy face from me, but overlook my offences at this hour, "Thou that overlookest the sins of men on repentance. Wash "away the filth of my body and the defilement of my soul, and "sanctify me wholly and entirely with Thy invisible power and "spiritual right hand, lest announcing freedom to others, and im-"parting it through the faith of Thy unspeakable love for men, "I myself should be a castaway as the servant of sin. Nay, O "Lord, who only art Good and compassionate, let me not be "turned away ashamed, but send forth to me power from on high, "and strengthen me to this ministry."

the almost electric rapidity with which these principles are confessedly passing from one breast to another, from one end of England to the other, the sympathy, which they find in the sister or daughter Churches of Scotland and America, might well make men suspect that there is more than human agency at work; this indeed has been acknowledged; and they who have not seen GOD's hand in it, have attributed it to Satan [1]; yet will they too in time, we trust, see its fruits to be good, and acknowledge that Satan is not "divided against himself;" and now also they attribute to him, we hope, not the actual workings, but rather those which they apprehend. A note has been struck (I may speak, my Lord, on this subject, as not speaking boastfully, since it was not I who thought of striking it,) which was vibrated through every part of the frame of our Church, attesting at once the unity of the body, which so responded, and that itself had been attuned to it by a higher unseen Hand. They who struck the note were but as the bow in the hand of Him, who blends into harmony men's discordant wills, and out of their varying affections brings forth one concordant whole. Others have assayed to do it before and as faithfully, and under circumstances which seemed more favourable, yet none answered; "they piped, but none danced; they mourned, but "none wept:" and now that some of the doctrines had seemed to be gradually expiring, and those who

[1] Essays, p. 278, seqq.

had handed them down amid a forgetful generation, were drawing toward the close of their labours, the closed ear has been unsealed, and the sleeping sympathy been awakened; showing in both cases Whose it is to "waken[1] the ear to hear as the learned;" perhaps, as the prelude of a time, when, more than hitherto, "the eyes[2] of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped." For all things seem to be drawing one way. The simultaneous tendency towards a more Church-feeling among ourselves, among bodies separated from us, or again in Germany and Denmark feeling after it, (although in the absence of a Church-system which has been preserved to us, not knowing where to find it,) the increased energy of Romanism itself, (at least in France and America where it exists in its least corrupted form,) all point to some further coming of the Redeemer's kingdom, when what is done shall be done in His Name, not in man's; by His Church, and by individuals as members of it, not in themselves. The watch-word for our re-union is that, wherein God had made us one in Himself, His Church; not as an establishment, or as unestablished,—these are but accidents in her existence, and to be dealt with according to the Apostolic rule, "wherein any have been called, therein let him remain with God," in England let us not seek to be unestablished, nor in the United States to be established—not as an instrument

[1] Is. l. 4. [2] Ib. xxxv. 5.

of temporal or spiritual power, but as a well-ordered society, invested with spiritual gifts, and having a spiritual existence, and united with its Invisible Head, the channel of His graces to us, and wherein we are in Him, wherein "God hath set[1], first, "Apostles" (and as their successors, the Bishops), "secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers," "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for "the edifying of the body of Christ till we all come, "in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of "the Son of God unto [one] perfect man, unto the "measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ[2]." Disunion has been the bane of the Church, ever since suspicion and separation fell upon the Eastern and Western Churches; attempts outwardly to cement what has been so severed have ever failed: so an inanimate body may be cemented, not a living and spiritual body: but now that men's spirits in different countries seem to be drawn—not directly together or to compass unions of Churches by man's arrangement or human wisdom, but to converge—towards One common Centre, wherein all shall find themselves united; when men severally mourn over the decay in which the City of God lies, and "pity[3] the dust thereof," then may we hope that "the hea-"then shall fear the Name of the Lord, and all the "kings of the earth His glory," then "the Lord shall build up Zion, He shall appear in His glory;" and

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 28. [2] Eph. ii. 12. [3] Ps. cii. 13—16.

our "night of heaviness" shall be past, and "joy come" in the "dawning of the morning" which the Christian Church has so long "watched for." When we feel the miseries of our disunion, and humble ourselves for our share of it, then may we hope that He "will bind up the breaches," and the "One shepherd" will restore the fences of our "one fold," when we have learnt to long for it.

To you, my Lord, in whatever degree we might hope that we were in this our portion of the Vineyard but the lowest and meanest labourers towards this glorious restoration, we owe much real thanks, as well for the fatherly encouragement which you have given us, as for the warning which you have conveyed to those especially, who have learned of us. It has been a singular mercy of God to us hitherto, that no extravagance has connected itself with the doctrines to which we have claimed attention. Such had perhaps never been the case at any former restoration of forgotten doctrine. It is a familiar argument in such cases, that "the abuse is no argument against the use," and the very frequency of the maxim shows how closely the abuse attends upon the use. When a system now very popular was commenced, it had often to apologize for the extravagancies of those to whom it was a passage to dissent; and even of late years, it has not been unfrequent that even ministers of this class have fallen off into schism: to us, they have been able at present to object only what they deem a *tendency* towards Ro-

manism, but have not shown any case in which that tendency has been followed out. And this, as we thankfully acknowledge it to have been a great mercy of God, so has He doubtless in part thereby brought it about, that these doctrines have in the first instance mainly taken root in the University, which nurtured ourselves. For the solid, and real, and self-denying training and discipline which has made this University what it is, has prepared the minds of those committed to her, to receive simply, and solidly, and practically, the Catholic system, when they became acquainted with it. Catholic truth is indeed so intrinsically practical, that it is less exposed than any human system, however apparently spiritual, to be received as a mere theory. Even where it has been embraced without any consciousness of sacrifices involved, it has in well-prepared minds gradually drawn toward the shore those whom it had inclosed in its net; they contentedly found their liberty circumscribed; the submission to rightful authority characteristic of the true Catholic system repressed too individual tendencies; it wound itself around them; encircled them with its solemn rounds of duties and devotions and abstinences, thwarting the natural will, and subduing self, calming the passions and elevating the affections; not acting turbidly, but rather unloosing limb by limb from their enthralments, and gently moulding and fashioning them to perform the fuller measures of the duties of the Gospel. It is of the very nature of Catholic truth to merge self, and with

it the extravagancies of self, in the sense of being a member of CHRIST in the Communion of His glorious Saints; to suppress thoughts, as if any were doing great things, by the sense of doing them under authority and guidance. One has begun probably by one portion of the system, another by another, as Providence guided his disposition or his circumstances; yet as he took up, one by one, increasing duties, he found himself but filling up voids in himself; his unevenness or inequalities softened; inconsistencies subdued, and himself by each such approximation, only rendered less out of harmony with the system in which he was placed; not thinking himself "some great one," but rather "an unprofitable servant," who was slowly learning to "do that which it was his duty to do."

But although such, by the mercy of GOD, has been the course of things hitherto, and one may appeal with confidence to the general character of our younger members, who, whether consciously or unconsciously, have been absorbed into the system, that this change has, as a whole, manifested itself in a subdued and chastened spirit, we cannot expect that if the purifying obloquy, under which we now lie, should be withdrawn, there will not be found those who will embrace that system intellectually only, or take the shadow for the substance, and so bring evil repute upon it. Satan has ever sown tares among the wheat; and the parable seems by its frequent fulfilment to have the nature of a prophecy, that it should ever be so. If the

Church be that great instrument of blessing, which Scripture implies, and which we in our Creeds profess, one must expect that Satan will in varying ways endeavour to seduce men from realizing it, and to continue their depreciation of it. It were too bold to hope that the truths now anew recognized, will not be overcast by some clouds, which the god of this world may be permitted to interpose. Enough, if their general influence be to warm and kindle. Even of Divine Grace it has been said, that "like the sun, whom it does not soften, it hardens;" much more then of any form of Divine Truth.

It were then nothing, whereat to be dismayed, were Satan allowed in some cases, to pervert these doctrines, and mislead into Popery some who had partially embraced them. There was a Simon Magus among the first baptized Christians; the Anabaptists and the Socinians were a produce of the reformation. We are conscious also, that the press is but a rude way of disseminating truth; it conveys it on the whole, but unadapted to particular cases; and so it often happens, as in the case of human medicines, that persons will misapply them, those who need them will neglect them, others use them wrongly, or employ them, while continuing in habits of life, which neutralize them, or make them pernicious. In a sounder state of the Church, where all the members of our flocks would have spiritual advisers, and the advisers themselves be more carefully trained, this evil

would be much mitigated; meanwhile, the system will bear the blame of what it would provide against, would men but adopt it completely.

This is said only for fear "offences should come," and some be scandalized at them; for the present, the influence of these truths has been rather exercised in the contrary and their rightful direction; furnishing a resting-place from Romanism to some who were wandering thither, and recovering others from it to the bosom of our English branch of the Church: meanwhile we commit cheerfully our way unto Him who has thus far prospered His truth; trusting, not in the Church-system, but in Him who ordered it: not in the force of truth only, but in Him Who is the Truth; not in the Church, but in Him Who is "its Saviour," and "Who gave Himself for "it, that He might cleanse it by the washing of "water in the word, and present it to Himself a "glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any "such thing, but that it might be holy and without "blemish." That your Lordship's endeavours for the good of that portion of the Church committed unto you, may be prospered, is our daily prayer: to obey your godly admonitions, and to follow your guidance, is our earnest desire. May He, who has called you to this high office, make it hereafter your crown and joy, and requite you, as well for your labours and anxieties, as for your kindness to those who labour under you in the Vineyard.

With true respect for your sacred character, and (if it be not too bold) affectionate acknowledgment of your Lordship's unvarying kindness,

I have the honour to remain,

Your Lordship's faithful servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church,
Feast of St. Matthias, 1839.

PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS OF THE ABOVE LETTER.

PAGE

Art. VI. and XX.—On the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation; *and* Of the authority of the Church..... 26

Art. XI.—Of the justification of Man..... 62

Art. XVI.—Of sin after Baptism 81

Art. XXV.—On the Sacraments..... 97

Baptism 109

Art. XXVIII.—Of the Lord's Supper 125

Art. XXIII.—Of ministering in the Congregation..... 146

Prayers for those departed in the faith and fear of God.... 186

Invocation of Saints..... 192

Celibacy 208

APPENDIX.

EXTRACTS

FROM THE

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES,

THE

LYRA APOSTOLICA,

AND

OTHER PUBLICATIONS;

SHOWING THAT

TO OPPOSE ULTRA-PROTESTANTISM
IS NOT
TO FAVOUR POPERY.

EXTRACTS,

&c.

EXTRACTS FROM THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

1. "It is certain that the Bishops and Clergy in England and Ireland remained the same as before the separation; and that it was these, with the aid of the civil power, who delivered the Church of those kingdoms from the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation; while at the same time they gradually removed from the minds of the people various superstitious opinions and practices which had grown up during the middle ages."—No. 15. p. 4.

2. "That there is not a word in Scripture about our duty to obey the Pope, is quite clear. The Papists, indeed, say that he is the successor of St. Peter; and that, therefore, he is head of all Bishops, because St. Peter bore rule over the other Apostles. But though the Bishops of Rome were often called the successors of St. Peter in the early Church, yet every other Bishop had the same title. And though it be true that St. Peter was the *foremost* of the Apostles, that does not prove that he had any dominion over them. . . . And so Rome has ever had what is called the *primacy* of the Christian Churches, but it has not, therefore, any right to interfere in their internal administration."—*Ibid.* p. 5.

3. "But it may be said, that we have really no valid orders, as having received them from an heretical Church. True, Rome may be so considered now; but she was not heretical in the primitive ages."—*Ibid.* p. 10.

4. "It may be said, that we threw blame on Luther, and others of the foreign Reformers, who *did* act without the authority of their Bishops. But we reply, that it has been always agreeable to the principles of the Church, that, if a Bishop taught and upheld what was contrary to the orthodox faith, the clergy and people were not bound to submit, but were obliged to maintain the true religion."—*Ibid.* p. 11.

5. "While they [the writer and others] consider that the revival of this portion of truth is especially adapted to break up existing parties in the Church, and to form instead a bond of union among all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; they believe that nothing but these neglected doctrines, faithfully preached, will repress that extension of Popery, for which the ever-multiplying divisions of the religious world are too clearly preparing the way."—*Advertisement to Vol.* i. p. 5.

6. "You have some misgivings, it seems, lest the doctrine I have been advocating 'should lead to Popery.' I will not, by way of answer, say, that the question is not whether it will *lead to Popery*, but whether it is *in the Bible;* because it would bring the Bible and Popery into one sentence, and seem to imply the possibility of a 'communion' between 'light and darkness.' No; it is the very enmity I feel against the Papistical corruptions of the Gospel, which leads me to press upon you a doctrine of Scripture, which we are sinfully surrendering, and the Church of Rome has faithfully retained.

"How comes it that a system so unscriptural as the Popish makes converts? Because it has in it an element of truth and comfort amid its falsehoods. And the true way of opposing it is not to give up to them that element, which GOD's providence has preserved to us also, thus basely surrendering 'the inheritance of our fathers,' but to claim it as our own."—*No.* 20. p. 1.

7. "Truly when one surveys the grandeur of their system, a sigh arises in the thoughtful mind, to think that we should be separate from them: Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!—But, alas! AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE[1]. Their communion is infected with heterodoxy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of GOD's truth; and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed; it cannot be reformed."—*Ibid.* p. 3.

8. "He has wonderfully preserved our Church as a true branch of the Church Universal, yet withal preserved it free from doctrinal heresy. It is Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical. . . . Depend upon it, to insist on the doctrine of the visible Church is not to favour the Papists, it is to do them the most serious injury. It is to deprive them of their only strength."—*Ibid.* p. 4.

9. "—Though it may please GOD that we should suffer for a while—as we suffered, together with good King Charles, at the hands of the dissenters; as we suffered in the days of bloody Queen Mary, at the hands of the Roman Catholics; as we suffered during the first three hundred years after CHRIST, at the hands of the Heathens and the Jews, yet—eventually, triumph will await us."—*No.* 23. p. 3.

10. "As to the *manner* of the presence of the body and blood of our LORD in the Blessed Sacrament, we that are Protestant and Reformed, according to the ancient Catholic Church, do not search into the manner of it with perplexing inquiries. . . . Had the Romish maintainers of Transubstantiation done the same, they would not have determined and decreed, and then imposed as an article of faith absolutely necessary to salvation, a manner of presence, newly by them invented, under pain of the most direful curse; and there would have been in the Church less wrangling, and more peace and

[1] Vid. infr. Extract 50.

unity than now is."—*No.* 27. p. 2.—*Bishop Cosin on Transubstantiation.*

11. "It is in vain that they bring Scripture to defend this their stupendous doctrine [transubstantiation]; and it is not true, what they so often and so confidently affirm, that the Universal Church hath always constantly owned it: being it was not so much as heard of in the Church for many ages, and hath been but lately approved by the Pope's authority in the Councils of Lateran and Trent."—*Ibid.* p. 16.

12. "The history of the Papists is this. Many centuries ago, strange and corrupt notions and practices prevailed in many of the Churches in Europe. Among others, people thought the Pope or Bishop of Rome was gifted with authority from Heaven to control all the branches of the Church on earth, and that his word was to be of more weight than even the Holy Scriptures themselves. But about three hundred years ago, the Bishops of the Church of England saw these errors in their true light."—*No.* 30. p. 5.

13. "*Clericus.* Say more definitely what the charge against me is.

Laicus. That your religious system, which I have heard some persons style the Apostolical, and which I so name by way of designation, is like that against which our forefathers protested at the Reformation.

C. I will admit it, *i. e.*, if I may reverse your statement, and say that the Popish system resembles it. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, seeing that all corruptions of the truth must be like the truth which they corrupt, else they would not persuade mankind to take them instead of it?"—*No.* 38. p. 1.

14. "Be assured of this,—no party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and makes noise, than the Roman party. This has been proved before now. In the seventeenth century, the theology of the divines of the English Church was substantially the same as ours is; and it experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. It was the true Via Media: Rome sought to block up that way, as fiercely as the Puritans. History tells us this. In a few words, then, before we separate, I will state some of my irreconcileable differences with Rome as she is; and in stating her errors, I will closely follow the order observed by Bishop Hall in his treatise on *The Old Religion,* whose Protestantism is unquestionable.

I consider that it is unscriptural to say with the Church of Rome, that 'we are justified by inherent righteousness.'

That it is unscriptural that 'the good works of a man justified do *truly* merit eternal life.'

That the doctrine of transubstantiation, as not being revealed, but a theory of man's devising, is profane and impious.

That the denial of the cup to the laity, is a bold and unwarranted encroachment on their privileges as Christ's people.

That the sacrifice of masses, as it has been practised in the Roman

Church, is without foundation in Scripture or antiquity, and therefore blasphemous and dangerous.

That the honour paid to images is very full of peril, in the case of the uneducated, that is, of the great part of Christians.

That indulgences, as in use, are a gross and monstrous invention of later times.

That the received doctrine of purgatory is at variance with Scripture, cruel to the better sort of Christians, and administering deceitful comfort to the irreligious.

That the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue is a great corruption.

That forced confession is an unauthorized and dangerous practice.

That the direct invocation of saints is a dangerous practice, as tending to give, often actually giving, to creatures the honour and reliance due to the Creator alone.

That there are not seven sacraments.

That the Roman doctrine of Tradition is unscriptural.

That the claim of the Pope to be universal bishop is against Scripture and antiquity.

I might add other points in which also I protest against the Church of Rome, but I think it enough to make my confession in Hall's order, and so leave it."—*Ibid.* p. 11.

15. "Rome has to confess her Papal corruptions, and her cruelty towards those who refuse to accept them."—*No.* 8. p. 4.

16. "The Church has in a measure forgotten its own principles, as declared in the sixteenth century; nay, under stranger circumstances, as far as I know, than have attended any of the errors and corruptions of the Papists. Grievous as are their declensions from primitive usage, I never heard in any case of their practice directly contradicting their services; whereas we go on lamenting once a year the absence of discipline in our Church, yet do not even dream of taking any one step towards its restoration."—*No.* 41. p. 1.

17. "Do you not suppose that there are multitudes both among clergy and laity at the present day, who disparage not indeed CHRIST's merits, but the sacraments He has appointed? and if so, is not their error so far the same in kind as that of the Romish church—the preferring Abana and Pharpar to the waters of Jordan! . . . Happily we are not as yet so corrupted as at the era of the Reformation; . . . yet is not the mode of viewing the subject I refer to, a growing one, and how does it differ from the presumption of the Papists? In both cases the power of CHRIST's sacraments is denied; in the one case by the unbelief of restlessness and fear, in the other by the unbelief of profaneness."—*Ibid.* p. 2.

18. "Our Reformers in the sixteenth century did not touch the existing documents of doctrine; there was no occasion; they kept the creeds as they were; but they *added* protests against the corruptions of faith, worship, and discipline, which had grown up round them."—*Ibid.* p. 3.

19. "While Dissenters are exclusive on the one hand, Papists are so on the other. The council of Trent converted certain theological opinions into (what they maintained to be) Catholic verities. This was wrong, whoever did it; but it is some comfort to find, that the body that thus became uncatholic, was not the Church Catholic itself."—*No.* 61. p. 3.

20. "This case [departure from antiquity] had been instanced even before Vincentius's time, in the history of the Arians. In our own day it is fulfilled in the case of the Church of Rome, which indeed has not erred *vitally*, as the Arians did, nor has infected with its errors the whole Church, yet has to answer for very serious corruptions, which it has not merely attempted, but managed to establish in a great part of the Churches of Christendom. Here then apply Vincentius's test—Antiquity; and the Church of Rome is convicted of unsoundness, as fully as those other sects among us which have already been submitted to the trial."—*Records of the Church, No.* XXIV. p. 3.

21. "How miserably contrasted are we with the One Holy Apostolic Church of old, which 'serving with one consent,' spoke 'a pure language!' And now that Rome has added, and we have omitted in the catalogue of sacred doctrines, what is left to us but to turn our eyes sorrowfully and reverently to those ancient times, and, with Bishop Ken, make it our profession to live and 'die in the faith of the Catholic Church before the division of the East and West?'" —*Ibid. No.* XXV. p. 11.

22. "The following are selected by way of specimen of those practical grievances to which Christians are subjected in the Roman communion:—1. The denial of the cup to the laity. 2. The necessity of the priest's intention to the validity of the sacraments. 3. The necessity of confession. 4. The unwarranted anathemas of the Roman Church. 5. Purgatory. 6. Invocation of saints. 7. Images." —*No.* 71. p. 9, *et seq.*

23. "We cannot consent to confine ourselves to a mere reference to the text of the Tridentine decrees, as Romanists would have us, apart from the teaching of their doctors, and the practice of the Church, which are surely the legitimate comment upon them. ... The conduct of the Catholics during the troubles of Arianism affords us a parallel case. They interpreted the language of the Creeds by the professed opinions of their framers. They would not allow error to be introduced into the Church by an artifice....Apply this to the case of Romanism. We are not indeed allowed to take at random the accidental doctrine or practice of this or that age, as an explanation of the decrees of the Latin Church; but when we see clearly that certain of these decrees have a natural tendency to produce certain evils, when we see those evils actually existing far and wide in that Church, in different nations and ages, existing especially where the system is allowed to act most freely—under such circumstances surely it is not unfair to consider our case parallel to that of the Catholics

during the ascendancy of Arianism—and to apprehend that, did we express our assent to the creed of Pope Pius, we should find ourselves bound hand and foot—to the corruptions of those who profess it."—*Ibid.* p. 15, *et seq.*

24. "Should it be inquired whether this admission of incompleteness in our own system does not lead to projects of change and reform, on the part of individuals, it must be answered plainly in the negative. Such an admission has but reference to the question of *abstract* perfection; as a practical matter, it will be our wisdom as individuals to enjoy what GOD's good providence has left us, lest, striving to obtain more, we lose what we still possess."—*Ibid.* p. 35.

25. "One great unfairness practised by Roman controversialists has been to adduce in behalf of their own peculiarities, doctrines or customs of the primitive Church, which resembling them in appearance are really of a different character. Thus because the early Fathers spoke of the Holy Communion in such reverent and glowing terms, as became those who understood its real nature and virtue, they have tried to make it appear that they believed in their own theory of transubstantiation. Whereas they spoke of it as a *commemorative* sacrifice, they have thence taken occasion to make it a *real* and *proper* sacrifice. The doctrine of ecclesiastical penances they have converted into the theory of satisfactions to Almighty GOD for sins committed. The existence of *Apostolical tradition* in the early Church, in behalf of the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and the like, has been made a pretence for introducing *so-called* Apostolical traditions concerning various unfounded opinions in faith and practice."—*No.* 72. p. 1.

26. "Of course there is no reason why the Church might not, in the use of her discretion, limit as well as select the portions of the inspired volume which were to be introduced into her devotions; but there were serious reasons why she should not defraud her children of 'their portion of meat in due season;' and it would seem as if the eleventh, or at least the twelfth century, a time fertile in other false steps in religion, must be charged also, as far as concerns Rome and its more intimate dependencies, with the partial removal of the light of the written word from the sanctuary."—*No.* 75. p. 7.

27. "Haymo's edition, which was introduced into the Roman Church by Nicholas III. A. D. 1278, is memorable for another and still more serious fault. Graver and sounder matter being excluded, apocryphal legends of saints were used to stimulate and occupy the popular mind; and a way was made for the use of those invocations to the Virgin and other saints, which heretofore were unknown in public worship. The addresses to the Blessed Mary in the Breviary, as it is at present constituted, are such as the following: the Ave Mary, before commencing every office through the day, and at the end of compline; at the end of Lauds and Vespers, an Antiphon invocatory of the Virgin; the Officium B. Mariæ on the Sabbath or Saturday,

and sundry other offices, containing hymns and antiphons in her honour. These portions of the Breviary carry with them their own plain condemnation, in the judgment of an English Christian; no commendation of the general structure and matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency to reconcile him to them, &c. . . . These usages [Invocations] certainly *now* do but sanction and encourage that direct worship of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which is the great practical offence of the Latin Church."—*Ibid.* p. 9.

28. "They [the Invocations] are here given in order to show clearly, as a simple inspection of them will suffice to do, the utter contrariety between the Roman system, as actually existing, and our own; which, however similar in certain respects, are in others so at variance, as to make any attempt to reconcile them together in their present state, perfectly nugatory. Till Rome moves towards us, it is quite impossible that we should move towards Rome; however closely we may approximate to her in particular doctrines, principles, or views."—*Ibid.* p. 23.

29. "And further still, as regards the doctrine of purgatorial suffering, there have been for many ages in the Roman Church gross corruptions of its own doctrine, untenable as that doctrine is even by itself. The decree of the Council of Trent acknowledges the fact. Now we believe that those corruptions still continue; that Rome has never really set herself in earnest to eradicate them. The pictures of Purgatory so commonly seen in countries in communion with Rome, the existence of Purgatorian societies, the means of subsistence accruing to the clergy from belief in it, afford a strange contrast to the simple wording and apparent innocence of the decree by which it is made an article of faith. It is the contrast between poison in its lifeless seed, and the same developed, thriving, and rankly luxuriant in the actual plant."—*No.* 79. p. 3.

30. [As to the tendency to substitute the Virgin as the object of religious worship.] "The great Catholic doctrine of the Trinity being so strongly established among them [the Romanists] by entering into all their devotional forms and creeds, that it could not be shaken; human depravity has sought out an opening for itself under another shape. It is by this means the natural heart lowers the object of its worship to its own frailty."—*No.* 80. p. 80.

31. "The Romish Church corrupted and marred the Apostolic doctrine in two ways—first, by the error of Transubstantiation, secondly, by that of Purgatory; and in both there occurs that peculiar corruption of the administrators of the Romish Church, that they countenance so much more of profitable error than in their abstract system they acknowledge."—*No.* 81. *On the Eucharistic Sacrifice,* p. 7.

32. "These false notions in themselves aggrandized the character of the priesthood: and as such, it was part of the unhappy policy

of Rome to countenance them; and while (to take the mildest view) she narrowly observed the erroneous tendencies, which were almost unavoidably mixed up in the minds of individuals with the reformed doctrine, she had no sense for her own. She thought no deeds cruel, which would remove the motes that threatened to darken her sister's eye, but perceived not the beam in her own. While repressing, even by the shedding of blood, the slightest approximation to the reformed doctrine, she rebuked not errors which entrenched on the authority of our LORD."—*Ibid.* p. 8.

33. "The language of the Council (of Trent) on the Sacrifice is in itself capable of a good interpretation, were it not that terms employed in it must be explained with reference to that Church's acknowledged doctrines of Transubstantiation and Purgatory. AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRIFICE CANNOT BE THE SAME, WHERE TRANSUBSTANTIATION IS HELD, AND WHERE IT IS NOT."—*Ibid.* p. 47.

EXTRACTS FROM "LYRA APOSTOLICA."

34. "Once, as I brooded o'er my guilty state,
A fever seized me, duties to devise
To buy me interest in my Saviour's eyes;
Not that His love I would extenuate,
But scourge and penance, and perverse self-hate,
Or gift of cost, served by an artifice
To quell my restless thoughts, &c. . . .
Thus as I tossed, He said: 'Even holiest deeds
Shroud not the soul from GOD, nor soothe its needs,'" &c.
Lyra Apostolica, (Ed. 2.) 9.

35. "I will not say with these, that bread and wine
Have vanished at the consecration prayer," &c.
Ibid. 33.

36. "Ah, Saviour, LORD! with Thee my heart
Angel nor Saint shall share;
To Thee 'tis known, for man Thou art,
To soothe each tumult there."—*Ibid.* 51.

37. "They are at rest:
We may not stir the heaven of their repose
By rude invoking voice, or prayer addrest
In waywardness to those,
Who in the mountain grots of Eden lie," &c.—*Ibid.* 52.

38. "Mark how each Creed stands in that Test reveal'd,
Romish and Swiss and Lutheran novelties!
As in the light of Spenser's magic shield,
Falsehood lets fall her poisoned cup and flies,
Rome's seven-headed monster sees and dies!"—*Ibid.* 97.

39. "O LORD and CHRIST, Thy Churches of the South
So shudder, when they see

The two-edged sword sharp-issuing from Thy mouth,
As to fall back from Thee,
And seek to charms of man, or saints above,
To aid them against Thee, Thou Fount of grace and love!

But I before Thine awful eyes will go,
And firmly fix me there,
In my full shame;" &c.—*Ibid.* 105.

40. " The flood-gates on me open wide,
And headlong rushes in the turbulent tide
Of lusts and heresies! a motley troop they come;
And old imperial Rome
Looks up, and lifts again half-dead
Her seven-horned head;" &c.—*Ibid.* 111.

41. " How shall I name thee, Light of the wide West,
Or heinous error-seat?
O Mother erst, close tracing Jesus' feet!
Do not thy titles glow
In those stern judgment fires, which shall complete
Earth's strife with Heaven, and ope the eternal woe?"
Ibid. 170.

42. " O Mother Church of Rome! why has thy heart
Beat so untruly towards thy northern child?
Why give a gift, nor give it undefiled,
Drugging thy blessing with a stepdame's art? &c.
. . . And now thou sendest foes
Bred from thy womb, lost Church! to mock the throes
Of thy free child, thou cruel-natured Rome!"—*Ibid.* 171.

43. " O that thy creed were sound!
For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,
By thy unwearied watch and varied round
Of service, in thy Saviour's holy home."— *Ibid.* 172.

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF DR. PUSEY.

44. " In different ways man would forestall the sentence of his judge; the Romanist by the sacrament of penance; a modern class of divines by the appropriation of the merits and righteousness of our blessed Redeemer; the Methodists by sensible experience; our own, with the ancient Church, preserves a reverent silence, not cutting off hope, and yet not nurturing an untimely confidence, or a presumptuous security."—*Pusey on Baptism*, p. xiv.

44. (*b*) " Lastly, I would beseech those, for whom these tracts are mainly intended, our younger labourers in the Lord's vineyard, for their own sakes, as well as of those, of whose souls they must give account, neither here, nor in any other portion of these tracts, to be deterred by any vague fear of an approximation (as they may

be led to think) to any doctrines or practices of the corrupt Church of Rome ; not to allow themselves to fall in with any of those charges, which ignorant men are wont to make, of 'the early corruptions of Christianity,' and which are the bulwark of Socinianism, and of every other heresy. Since the Swiss reformers set aside primitive antiquity, and took a new model of their own, Antiquity, if tried by the standard of Zuinglianism or Calvinism, must, of course, appear to approximate to the modern Church of Rome ; for that Church has retained, in a corrupted form, doctrines and rites, which the Swiss reformation rejected. Hence, the Lutheran (see p. 104), the Bohemian (p. 233), and our own Church, have, by the admirers of that reformation, ever been looked upon as Papistical ; as they, in their turn, have, by the 'extreme reformation of the Socinians' (p. 198-9), been held, and rightly, to have stopped short of the results of their own principles, and have been represented, though wrongly, as retainers of Alexandrian 'corruptions of Christianity.' Hooker's defence of our Church is but one instance of this wide difference between ours and the Zuinglian reformation. Our Church (blessed be GOD,) never took Luther, or Calvin, or any modern name for its teacher or its model, but primitive antiquity : and by the Holy Scripture alone, and the universal consent of Primitive Antiquity, as the depository of its doctrines, and the witness of its teaching, would she be judged [1]. In these principles of our dear mother, the Church of England, have we been trained, and in these old ways we would humbly tread."—*Ibid.* p. xvii.

45. "We cannot sufficiently admire the lovingkindness of Almighty GOD, who allowed the seeds indeed of Reformation to be sown among us by Wickliffe ; yet then, notwithstanding the powerful human aid which he had, and his great popularity, caused them to lie, as it were, in the earth, until those which were less sound should, by length of time, decay ; and again, that He placed so many impediments in the way of our final Reformation (for what man does rapidly he does rashly), and held back our steps by the arbitrariness of Henry ; and, when we were again going down the stream of the times too readily, checked us at once by the unexpected death of Edward, and proved us by the fire of the Marian persecution, and took away, by a martyr's death, those in whom we most trusted ; and then finally employed a number of labourers, in the restoration of His Temple, of whom none should yet be so conspicuous, that the edifice should seem to be his design, or that he should be tempted to restore the decayed parts according to any theory of his own, but rather that all things should be made according to the pattern which He had shown us in the Church primitive. Had our reform taken place at first, we had been Wickliffites ; under Edward, we had been a branch of the Reformed

[1] There are some brief, but valuable notices of the peculiarity of the Church of England in the late Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions, and some striking quotations from ancient divines, domestic and foreign, who have remarked it, as an excellence ; so also in Bp. Bull's Apologia pro Harmonia, sect. I. § 4. ed. Burton.

Zuinglian or the Calvinist Church: now we bear no human name; we look to no human founder; we have no one reformer to set up as an idol; we are neither of Paul nor of Apollos; nor have we any human maxims or theories as the basis of our system; but we have been led back at once to the distant fountains, where the waters of life, fresh from their source, flowed most purely."—*Ibid.* pp. 105, 106.

46. "In this, as in many other cases, we must distinguish between the practical corruptions of the Church of Rome and her theoretical errors. For it often happens that she leads her members into error, and countenances corruption in them, when her statements in themselves are not very unsound; teaching us how much evil what seems a little departure from the truth may create."—*Ibid.* p. 192.

47. "In justice then to ourselves, as well as to the Romanists, we must bear in mind that the unhappy and fatal canons of the Council of Trent were directed, in part, against actual error, such as had mixed itself with the then, as well as with former, attempts at reformation. And we should do well to recollect that, though bound to thank GOD for all those, through whom the light of the Gospel shone more clearly, we always were regarded by them as a distinct and peculiar Church, and are not to identify ourselves with them."—*Ibid.* p. 194.

48. "Alexandria, the bulwark of the faith in the Holy Trinity, and North Africa, of the unmeritedness of GOD'S free grace, a desolation! Rome, once characterized for steady practical adherence to sound doctrine, a seat of Anti-Christ. Geneva, once proposed as the model of all reformed Churches, and of influence well nigh unbounded, and yet immediately the food of Socinianism, and now a prey to the heresy which came forth, but was for the time ejected, also from its bosom."—*Ibid.* p. 201.

49. "We can see how a person's whole views of Sanctification by the HOLY GHOST will be affected by Hoadly's low notions of the LORD'S Supper; or how the error of Transubstantiation has modified other true doctrine, so as to cast into the shade the one oblation once offered upon the Cross; or how the addition of the single practice of 'soliciting the saints to pray for men,' has in the Romish Church obscured the primary articles of Justification and of the Intercession of our Blessed LORD."—*Ibid.* 2nd Ed. p. 6.

50. "Having adopted the fiction of a letter from the Pope to certain members of your Church, as being his emissaries, it became necessary, by disguise, or omission, or perversion, to conceal whatever would have disturbed the unity of the drama. For instance, you play not unfrequently upon the words which one of these writers addresses to the Church of Rome—'Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!' and who would not echo the wish . . . that she, as ourselves have been, might be restored to her primeval purity, when she was once the guardian of Christian truth; that GOD would 'break the yoke of her burden, the staff on her shoulder, and the rod of her

oppressor?' Taken then in their obvious sense, the words are the expression of every Christian heart. Your fiction, however, required that they should express a desire for union with Rome AS SHE IS; and in this sense accordingly you quote them. The very next words of the writer contradict this. He proceeds (and to prevent the possibility of a mistake, he has printed these words in capitals): 'But, alas! AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE.' Honesty required the insertion of those words; but they would have spoiled the jest, and so they are omitted."—*Pusey's Earnest Remonstrance to the Author of the Pope's Letter* (*vide Vol.* iii. *of the Tracts,*) p. 8.

51. "The ground taken by the Church of Rome is, that all *her present* traditions are to be received as of equal validity with the written word, because she holds them; our ground, that they are not to be so received, because they cannot be proved to be apostolic, and some are corrupt and vainly invented. Our controversy then with Rome is not an *à priori* question on the value of tradition in itself. . . . but is one purely historical, that the Romanist traditions not being such, but on the contrary repugnant to Scripture, are not to be received. . . . Nor does our accepting the traditions of the *Universal* Church *in their day*, involve our accepting those of the particular Church of Rome, after so many centuries of corruption, *in the present*."—*Ibid.* p. 13.

52. "One not versed in history will be liable perpetually to confound the earlier truth, or unobjectionable custom, with the later corruption, especially if he has no very clear idea of Christian theology."—*Ibid.* p. 18.

53. "Now to this prayer (for the dead, in the first prayer-book,) neither Calvin nor Bucer objected that it was Papistical. On the contrary, Calvin says in his letter to the Protector, (Epp. p. 39. fol.) 'I hear that in the celebration of the Supper there is repeated a prayer for the departed, *and I well know that this cannot be construed into an approbation of the Papistical Purgatory.*'"—*Ibid.* p. 20.

54. "We never have, nor do we wish for any alteration in the liturgy of our Church; we bless GOD that our lot has fallen in her bosom,—that He has preserved in her the essentials of primitive doctrine and a liturgy so holy; and, although I cannot but think its first form preferable, alteration is out of the question: THERE CANNOT BE REAL ALTERATION WITHOUT A SCHISM; and as we claim to have our own consciences respected, so, even if we had the power of change, would we respect the consciences of others. . . . The whole course of the Tracts has, as you know, and yourself reproach us with, been against innovation."—*Ibid.* p. 28.

55. "You know that these authors had written also against Popery, and republished older writings against it: their very tracts are known by the name of 'Tracts against Popery and Dissent;' although, when they were commenced, dissent was everywhere a pressing evil, Popery had scarcely begun to bestir itself."—*Ibid.* p. 32.

56. "No one clergyman in or near Oxford has done any one thing as 'being justified by primitive antiquity;' but . . . whatever has

been done, has been done in obedience to the rubrics, or to carry them out into practice. . . . In no one church or chapel has any 'needless bowing' been introduced: clergymen, indeed, here always bow at the name of our Blessed LORD, wherever it occurs. . . In the cathedral the dean and canons have from time immemorial, on leaving the choir, bowed to the altar. No cross has been added to the surplice; only one clergyman, who was at the time at Oxford, but not connected with any parish church, thinking this to be enjoined by the rubric prefixed to the Morning Prayers, 'wore in the train of his ministration such ornaments as were in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.' The scarf had then, it is said, two small black crosses, one at each end. . . Whether the dress were that of Edward VI. I cannot say; it is enough for the principle that it was adopted as being sanctioned by the Church; and besides, one instance does not imply a system. Of 'unusual attitudes of devotion,' I know of none."—*Pusey's Letter to Townsend* (*British Mag.* vol. xii. p. 368.)

57. "Now let me first recapitulate what it is which has been thus blazoned about and exaggerated:—one clergyman has worn a cross on his scarf, in compliance, as he thought, with our rubric; two clergymen have in new congregations knelt towards the East, in conformity with the ancient, and recent, and still-existing practice of our Church; two have used a table, where the rubric implies that the elements must be placed somewhere, but says not how. Strong party-spirit has taken up these reports, not for their own sake (else why do they pass unnoticed irregular innovations in the mode of administering the Communion or Baptism?) but because it was easier so to cast a slur upon a body of men, and, through them, upon sound principles, than to refute them."—*Ibid.* p. 642.

58. "From the time that the Church of Rome began to forsake the principles of the Church Catholic, and grasp after human means, she began also to take evil means for good ends, and incurring the apostolic curse on those who 'do evil that good may come,' took at last evil means for evil ends. She, the Apostolic Church of the West, consecrated by Apostolic blood, showed herself rather the descendant of them who slew the Apostles, and 'thought that they did GOD service,' stained herself with the blood of the saints, that on her might come all the righteous blood which was shed within her: even of the very Apostles, who had shed blood for her. There is not an enormity which has been practised against people or kings by miscreants in the name of GOD, but the divines of that unhappy Church have abetted or justified."—*Pusey's Sermon on the Fifth of November*, p. 29.

59. "The principle of the Romish Church was expediency; it was a plotting, scheming, worldly spirit, having at first GOD's glory for its end, but seeking it by secular means, and at last, in punishment, left to seek its own glory, and to set itself up in the place of GOD."—*Ibid.* p. 31.

60. "It is not, God knoweth, in any spirit of boast against these branches, some of which were grafted in before us, but still in encouragement and warning, that I would notice, that herein also our Church followed the principles of the Church Catholic, and with her had been portioned. She alone of all the reformed Churches was purified in the fire, and purged by the blood of martyrs, and had the evidence of affliction that she was a beloved child, and no bastard." —*Ibid.* p. 32.

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF MR. NEWMAN.

61. "Various notions have led theological writers to implicate this celebrated Church [the Alexandrian] in the charge of heresy. . . . . The Romanists have thought . . . . to exalt the Apostolical purity of their own Church by the contrast of unfaithfulness in its early rival; and (what is of greater importance) to insinuate the necessity of an infallible authority, by exaggerating the errors and contrarieties of the ante-Nicene fathers, and the fact of its existence by throwing us upon the decisions of the later councils for the unequivocal statement of orthodox doctrine."—*Newman on Arianism*, p. 44.

62. "We agree with the Romanist in appealing to antiquity as our great teacher, but we deny that his doctrines are to be found in antiquity; and we maintain that his professed tradition is not really such, that it is a tradition of men, that it stops short of the Apostles, that the history of its introduction is known. On both accounts then his doctrines are innovations; because they run counter to the doctrine of antiquity, and because they rest upon what is historically an upstart tradition.—*Newman on Romanism*, p. 47, 48.

63. "How hopeless then is it to contend with Romanists, as if they practically agreed with us as to the foundation of faith, however much they pretend it! Ours is antiquity, theirs the existing Church. Its infallibility is their first principle; belief in it is a deep prejudice, quite beyond the reach of any thing external. It is quite clear that the combined testimonies of all the Fathers, supposing such a case, would not have a feather's weight against the decision of a Pope in Council."—*Ibid.* p. 86.

64. "We must take and deal with things as they are, not as they pretend to be. If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome, and make advances towards her as if a sister or a mother Church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relation, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within her reach. No; dismissing the dreams which the romance of early Church history, and the high doctrines of Catholicism will raise in the inexperienced mind, let us be sure that she is our enemy, and will do us a mischief if she can. For in truth she is a Church beside herself, abounding in noble gifts and rightful titles, but unable to use them religiously; crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as madmen are, or rather, she may be

said to resemble a demoniac, . . . ruled within by an inexorable spirit."—*Ibid.* p. 102, 103.

65. "My next instance shall be the Roman doctrine of Purgatory. All Protestants are sufficiently alive to the seriousness of this error. Now I think it may be shown that its existence is owing to a like indulgence of human reason, and of private judgment upon Scripture, in default of Catholic tradition."—*Ibid.* p. 212.

66. "Whether we be right or wrong, our theory of religion has a meaning, and that really distinct from Romanism. They maintain that faith depends upon the Church; we, that the Church is built upon the faith. By Church Catholic we mean the Church Universal; they those branches of it which are in Communion with Rome. Again, they understand by the faith, whatever the Church at any time declares to be faith; we, what it has actually so declared from the beginning. Both they and we anathematize those who deny the faith; but they extend the condemnation to all who question any decree of the Roman Church; we apply it to those only who deny any article of the original Apostolic creed."—*Ibid.* p. 259.

67. "The Thirty-nine Articles then are instruments of teaching, of Catholic teaching, being, as far as they go, heads, as it were, of important chapters in revealed truth. And it is as thus viewing them that we put them before the young. They are quite consistent with the prerogative accorded, as we have seen, by antiquity to the Apostolic Creed, quite distinct from the tyrannical enforcement of the Tridentine articles on the part of Rome."—*Ibid.* p. 290.

68. "This statement ('that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation,' Art. VI.) is very plain and clear except in one point, viz., who is to be the *judge* what is and what is not contained in Scripture. Our Church is silent on this point—very emphatically so. This is worth observing; in truth, she does not admit, strictly speaking, of any judge at all, in the sense in which Romanists and Protestants contend for one; and in this point, as in others, holds a middle course between extreme theories. Romanism, as we all know, maintains the existence of a judge of controversies; nay, an infallible one, that is, the Church Catholic. Again the multitude of Protestants consider every man his own judge; they hold that every man may or must read Scripture for himself; and judge about its meaning, and make up his mind for himself. We neither hold that the Catholic Church is an infallible judge of Scripture, nor that each individual may judge for himself; but that the Church has *authority*, and that individuals may judge for themselves outside the range of that authority. The Church is not a *judge* of the sense of Scripture in the common sense of the word, but a *witness*—a keeper and witness of Catholic tradition. She bears witness to a fact that such and such a doctrine, or such a sense of Scripture, has ever been received, and came from the Apostles."—*Ibid.* p. 327, *et seq.*

69. "Nor let any one be startled at all this discordance of opinion among our divines, in their mode of proving one of the

great principles of Protestantism [Scripture the rule of faith], as if it reflected upon the wisdom or soundness of the principle itself. Above all, let not Romanists venture to take advantage of it, lest we retort upon them the vacillations, absurdities, intrigues, and jealousies displayed in the deliberations of divines attendant on their general councils."—*Ibid.* p. 346.

70. "If this line of argument can be maintained, there will be this especial force in it as addressed to Romanists. They are accustomed to taunt us with inconsistency, as if we used the tradition of the Church only when and as far as we could not avoid it. . . . . We do *not* discard the tradition of the Fathers; we accept it; we accept it entirely; we accept its witness concerning itself and against itself. It witnesses to its own inferiority to Scripture."—*Ibid.* p. 349.

71. "Nothing I think is plainer from these extracts [some quoted from the Fathers] than that the authors of them looked upon Scripture as the public standard of proof, the tribunal of appeal in controversy."—*Ibid.* p. 399.

72. "Time went on, and he [Satan] devised a second idol of the true CHRIST, and it remained in the temple of GOD for many a year. The age was rude and fierce. Satan took the darker side of the Gospel. . . . The religion of the world was then a fearful religion. Superstitions abounded, and cruelties. The noble firmness, the graceful austerity of the true Christian, were superseded by forbidding spectres, harsh of eye, and haughty of brow; and these were the patterns or the tyrants of a beguiled people."—*Newman's Sermons,* vol. i. p. 359.

73. "Satan could not hinder, he could but corrupt the kingdom promised to the saints. He could but seduce them to trust in an arm of flesh. He could but sow the seeds of decay among them by alluring them to bow down to 'Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites,' and to make a king over them like the nations, 'when the LORD was their king.' Had it not been for this falling away in divers times and places, surely Christendom would not be in its present miserable state of disunion and weakness."—*Newman's Sermons,* vol. ii. p. 282.

74. "There have been ages of the world, in which men have thought too much of angels, and paid them excessive honour: honoured them so perversely as to forget the supreme worship due to Almighty GOD. This is the sin of a dark age."—*Ibid.* p. 400.

75. "It is too evident how grievously the Church of Rome has erred in this part of Christian duty [zeal]. Let her doctrines be as pure as her defenders maintain, still she has undisputably made the Church an instrument of worldly politics by a 'zeal not according to knowledge.' Let us grant that her doctrine was not fatally corrupted till the sixteenth century; nevertheless, from the eleventh at least she has made CHRIST'S kingdom of this world. I will not in-

quire whether she committed the additional most miserable sin of rebellion against Cæsar; though from what we see around us at this day there is great reason to fear that from the beginning of her power she has been tainted with it."—*Ibid.* p. 436.

76. "He will but observe that, if Popery be a perversion or corruption of the truth, as we believe, it must, by the mere force of the terms, be like that truth which it counterfeits; and, therefore, the fact of a resemblance, as far as it is borne out, is no proof of any essential approximation in his opinions to Popery as such. Rather, it would be a serious argument against their primitive character, if to superficial observers they bore no likeness to it. Ultra-Protestantism could never have been silently corrupted into Popery."—*Ibid.* vol. iii. *Advertisement.*

77. "A great part of the Christian world, as is well known, believes that after this life the souls of Christians ordinarily go into a prison called Purgatory, where they are kept in fire or other torment, till, their sins being burned away, they are at length fitted for that glorious kingdom into which nothing defiled can enter. Now, if there were any good reason for this belief, we should certainly have a very sad and depressing prospect before us. . . . But, in fact, CHRIST has mercifully interposed expressly to assure us that our friends are better provided for than this doctrine would make it appear. He assures us that they '*rest* from their labours, and their works do follow them.'"—*Ibid.* p. 408.

78. "It is 'JESUS CHRIST, before our eyes evidently set forth, crucified among us.' Not before our bodily eyes; so far, every thing remains at the end of that heavenly communion as it did at the beginning. What was bread remains bread, and what was wine remains wine. We need no carnal, earthly, visible miracle to convince us of the presence of the LORD incarnate."—*Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 167.

79. "While we think thus of the invisible Church, we are restrained by many reasons from such invocations of her separate members as are unhappily so common in other Christian countries. First, because the practice was not primitive, but an addition, which the world had poured into the Church; next, because we are told to pray to GOD only, and invocation may easily be corrupted into prayer, and then becomes idolatrous. And further, it must be considered that though the Church is represented in Scripture as a channel of GOD's gifts to us, yet it is only as a body, and sacramentally, not as an agent, nor in her members one by one. St. Paul does not say that we are brought near to this saint or that saint, but to all together; to the spirits of just men made perfect."—*Ibid.* p. 207.

80. "Hence the charge, not unfounded as regards Romanism, that it views, or tends to view, the influences of grace, not as the operations of a living GOD, but as a something to bargain about, and buy, and traffic with, as if religion were, not an approach to things above us, but a commerce with our equals concerning things we can master."—*Newman on Justification,* p. 316.

81. "The view of justification taken by Romanists and by a school of divines among ourselves, tends to fix the mind on self, not on CHRIST; whereas that which I have advocated as Scriptural and Catholic, buries itself in the vision of a present, an in-dwelling GOD." —*Ibid.* p. 220.

82. "So much space has been given to Bucer's doctrine, because he is in a small degree connected with our own Reformation; and such as his has been the current doctrine of the English Church. Our divines, though of very different schools, have, with few exceptions, agreed in this, that justification is gained by obedience in the shape of faith; that is, an obedience which confesses it is not sufficient, and trusts solely in Christ's merits for acceptance—not the Roman, that the obedience justifies without a continual imputation of Christ's merits; nor the Protestant, that the imputation justifies distinct from obedience."—*Ibid.* p. 420.

83. "The Council of Trent did, as regards Roman errors, what, for all we know, though God forbid, some future Synod of the English Church may do as regards Protestant errors, take them into her system, make them forms of communion, bind upon her hitherto favoured sons their grievous chain; and what that unhappy Council actually did for Rome, that does every one in his place and according to his power, who by declaiming against and denouncing those who dare to treat the Protestant errors as unestablished, gives a helping hand towards their establishment."—*Newman's Letter to Faussett*, p. 15.

84. "Who defends such things as these [worship of the Blessed Virgin]? who says the Church of Rome was free from them before Trent? . . . Why are the Tracts to be censured for stating a plain historical fact, that the Roman Church did not, till Trent, embody in her creed the mass of her present tenets, while they do not deny but expressly acknowledge her great corruptions before that era; while they give the history of Transubstantiation prior to Trent, (Nos. 27, 28.) of the breviary worship of the Blessed Virgin prior to Trent, (No. 79.) while they formally draw up points in which they feel agreement with Romanism to be hopeless, (Nos. 38. 71.) and while they declare, (in large letters to draw attention) that, while Rome is what it is, 'union' with it 'is impossible' (No. 20.)? All that can be said against them is, that in discussing the Roman tenets, they use guarded language; and this I will say, that the more we have personal experience of the arduous controversy in question, the more shall we understand the absolute necessity, if we are to make any way, of weighing our words and keeping from declamation."—*Ibid.* p. 18.

85. "It is idolatry to bow down to any emblem or symbol as divine which GOD Himself has not appointed; and since He has not appointed the worship of images, such worship is idolatrous. . . . . It is impossible for any religious man, *having* a crucifix, not to treat it with reverence . . . but . . . I more than doubt whether a crucifix, carved to represent life, as such memorials commonly are, be not

too true to be reverent, and too distressing for familiar contemplation. . . . So much I know, that the use of the crucifix is in this place no badge of persons whose mode of thinking you would condemn. How many crucifixes could be counted up in Oxford I know not; but you will find them in the possession of those who are no special friends or followers of Mr. Froude, and perhaps cordial admirers, except of course on this one point, of the tenor of your publication."—*Ibid.* p. 25. *In a Note*—"I know or have heard of the names of four persons altogether; one of the four I have forgotten, and another I cannot be sure I heard."

86. "O that we had the courage and the generous faith to aim at perfection, to demand the attention, to claim the submission of the world! Thousands of hungry souls in all classes of life stand around us; we do not give them what they want, the image of a true Christian people, living in that Apostolic awe and strictness which carries with it an evidence that they are the Church of CHRIST. This is the way to withstand and repel the Romanists; not by cries of alarm, and rumour of plots, and disputes, and denunciations, but by living up to the Creeds, the Services, the Ordinances, the usages of *our own* Church, without fear of consequences, without fear of being called Papists: to let matters take their course freely, and to trust to GOD's good Providence for the issue."—*Ibid.* p. 98.

EXTRACTS FROM FROUDE'S REMAINS.

87. "The Romanists [are not schismatics in England and Catholics abroad, but they] are wretched Tridentines every where."—*Froude's Remains*, vol. i. p. 434.

88. "I never could be a Romanist; I never could think all those things in Pope Pius' Creed necessary to salvation."—*Ibid.*

89. "We found to our horror, that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church made the acts of each successive Council obligatory for ever; that what had been once decided could not be meddled with again: in fact, that they were committed finally and irrevocably, and could not advance one step to meet us, even though the Church of England should again become what it was, in Laud's time, or indeed what it may have been up to the atrocious Council [of Trent]; for M.—— admitted that many things, *e. g.* the doctrine of mass, which were fixed then, had been indeterminate before. So much for the Council of Trent, for which Christendom has to thank Luther and the Reformers. . . . . I own it has altogether changed my notions of the Roman Catholics, and made me wish for a total overthrow of their system."—*Ibid.* pp. 307, 308.

90. "I remember you told me that I should come back a better Englishman than I went away; better satisfied not only that our Church is nearest in theory right, but also that practically, in spite of its abuses, it works better; and, to own the truth, your prophecy is already nearly realized. Certainly I have as yet only seen the surface of things; but what I have seen does not come up to my

notions of propriety. These Catholic countries seem in an especial manner *κατέχειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ* ["to hold the truth in unrighteousness."] And the priesthood are themselves so sensible of the hollow basis upon which their power rests, that they dare not resist the most atrocious encroachments of the State upon their privileges. . . I have seen priests laughing when at the Confessional; and indeed it is plain, that unless they habitually made light of very gross immorality, three-fourths of the population [of Naples] would be excommunicated. . . . . The Church of England has fallen low, and will probably be worse before it is better; but let the Whigs do their worst, they cannot sink us so deep as these people have allowed themselves to fall while retaining all the superficials of a religious country."—*Ibid.* p. 293, 294.

91. "Since I have been out here, I have got a worse notion of the Roman Catholics than I had. I really do think them idolaters, though I cannot be quite confident of my information as it affects the character of the priests. . . . What I mean by calling these people idolaters is, that I believe they look upon the Saints and Virgin as good-natured people that will try to get them let off easier than the Bible declares, and that, as they don't intend to comply with the conditions on which God promises to answer prayers, they pray to them as a come-off. But this is a generalization for which I have not sufficient data."—*Ibid. vide Preface,* p. xiii.

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF MR. KEBLE.

92. "The deep and sincere dread with which Hooker regarded the errors and aggressions of Rome is apparent in every part of his writings; and so much the more instructive will it prove, should we find him of his own accord embracing those Catholic opinions and practices, which some in their zeal for popery may have too lightly parted with, but which, as Rome alone could not give them, so neither should we allow her indirectly to take them away."—*From the Preface to Hooker,* p. iv.

93. "King James II. it is well known, ascribed to Hooker, more than to any other writer, his own ill-starred conversion to Romanism: against which, nevertheless, if he had thought a little more impartially, he might have perceived that Hooker's works every where inculcate that which is the only sufficient antidote, respect for the true Church of the Fathers, as subsidiary to Scripture and a witness of its true meaning."—*Ibid.* p. cv.

94. "The Freedom of the Anglican Church may be vindicated against the exorbitant claims of Rome, and yet no disparagement ensue of the authority inherent in the Catholic Apostolical Church." —*From the Sermon on Primitive Tradition,* p. 6.

95. "We are naturally, if not reasonably, jealous of the word Tradition, associated as it is in our minds with the undue claims and pernicious errors of Rome."—*Ibid.* p. 20.

96. "The genuine Canons of the Primitive Councils, and the

genuine fragments of the Primitive Liturgies, are reducible into a small space; even although we go so low down in both as the division of the Eastern and Western Churches, including the six first councils general, and excluding image-worship, and similar corruptions by authority."—*Ibid.* p. 40.

97. "The reverence of the Latin Church for tradition, being applied unscrupulously, and without the necessary check from Scripture, to opinions and practices of a date comparatively recent, has led a large portion of Christendom to disuse and contempt, not of Scripture only, but of that real and sure tradition, which they ought to have religiously depended upon."—*Ibid.* p. 45.

98. "Had this rule (the exclusion of novelty,) been faithfully kept, it would have preserved the Church just as effectually from Transubstantiation on the one hand, as from the denial of Christ's real Presence on the other hand. The two errors in the original are but Rationalism in different forms;—endeavours to explain away, and bring nearer to the human intellect, that which had been left thoroughly mysterious both by Scripture and Tradition."—*Ibid.* p. 47.

99. "Many men . . have argued against an imaginary case, instead of addressing themselves to the realities of Church History; and have thus given an advantage to Romanists on one side, and Rationalists on the other, of which neither party has been slow to avail itself. Such is not the way of the English Church; she does not so violently sever the different parts of the constitution of the Kingdom of Heaven; but acknowledging Scripture as her written charter, and Tradition as the common law whereby both the validity and practical meaning of that charter is ascertained, venerates both as inseparable members of one great providential system: without confounding their provinces, or opposing them to each other, in the manner of modern Rome. Why should it be thought a thing incredible, that persons should be found among her members and ministers, desirous to follow, as God shall give them grace, in so plain, so reasonable, so moderate, so safe a way? Because they call attention to the fact, that "*Primitive* Tradition is recognized in Holy Scripture," as being, AT THAT TIME, of paramount authority; why should they be presently suspected of having a system of their own in reserve,—a theory, like some parts of Romanism, *still* independent of Holy Scripture, and to be supported by *modern* traditions?"—*Ibid.* p. 74.

100. "Because the Romanists make bold with the word Tradition on very different matters from this—mere instructions of a part of the present Church, in no wise able to stand the test of Vincentius, even supposing them uncontradicted in Scripture:—are we therefore to throw aside or depreciate a Tradition, established as we see the Nicene Creed is?"—*Ibid.* p. 147.

101. "Of course, if so it had pleased Almighty God, the Scriptures might have been all clear of themselves; or their meaning might have been clearly revealed to individuals, at a certain stage of their progress in the Christian life; or there might be somewhere in the present Church an unerring court of appeal to fix their interpretation.

Men may go on imagining the advantages of such a dispensation, until they have persuaded themselves that things are really so ordered. But theories of that kind, after all that can be said in their favour, must they not incur the censure of true wisdom, as partaking of 'that idle and not very innocent employment of forming imaginary models of a new world, and schemes of governing it?' How much better, humbly to acquiesce in God's dispensations as we find them! How much more dutiful, with all seriousness to use our privilege of belonging to a Church, which, on the one hand, refers us to Scripture as the standard and treasure of all necessary doctrine, on the other hand, 'ties her doctors, as much as the Council of Trent does, to expound Scripture according to the consent of the ancient Fathers[1].'"—*Ibid.* p. 149.

[1] Bp. Taylor's Works, x. 322.

INDEX.

Additions, Roman, 21. 62
Anathemas, 10. 22. 83
Angel worship, 36. 74
Anglo-Catholics, contented, 24. 44b. 54. 101; not innovators in discipline, 56. 57; highly-favoured in their Reformation, 45; persecuted, 9. 45. 60; opposed to Romanism, 5. 6. 55. 93; successful in opposition, 86; always accounted Papistical by those who went further, 44b

Catholic doctrine and practices not derived from Rome, 92
Confession, forced, 14. 22
Corruptions, Roman, 6. 12. 13. 15. 16. 18. 20. 23. 26. 29. 31. 32. 38. 42. 43. 51. 52. 73. 75. 76
Corrupt state of Italian Churches, 90
Council of Trent, 23. 67. 83. 87. 89
Councils, General, 69

Dark ages, 26. 72. 74
Denial of Cup, 14. 22

Fathers subsidiary to Scripture, 93

Idolaters, Italian Romanists, 91
Idolatry, 85
Image-worship, 14. 22
Indulgences, 14
Infallibility, 12. 61. 63. 68. 89. 101
Intention in Sacraments, 22
Invocation of Saints, 14. 22. 27. 37. 49. 79

Justification, 14. 81. 82

Legends, 27

Masses, usage of, 14. 25. 33
Mediators, human, 39
Merits, 14. 34. 80

Penance, 25. 34. 44
Perversions, Roman, 23. 25. 46. 76
Popery, incurable, 7; a falling off, 73; pestilential, 7; malicious and cruel, 15. 64; rebellious, 75; tyrannical, 1. 67. 72; an insanity, 64; an evil spirit, *ibid.*; heretical, 3. 7. 8. 20; exclusive, 19; an apology for Luther, 4; caused by Luther, 89; irreconcileably different from us, 7. 14. 28. 50. 66. 84. 88; unscriptural, 6; presumptuous, 17; persecuting, 9. 32. 58; political, 58. 59. 75; rationalizes, 98; an Antichrist, 38. 40. 41. 48. 72.
Prayer for the dead in Christ, 53
Purgatory, 14, 22. 29. 31. 65. 77

Rome, its strength, 8; a demoniac, 64; its claims exorbitant, 94

Saint-worship, 30. 36. 84
Scripture, 70. 71
Supremacy, Roman, 2. 12. 14
Superstitions, Roman, 1. 72

Traditions, 25. 51. 62. 70. 95. 96. 97. 99. 100
Transubstantiation, 10. 11. 14. 25. 31. 33. 35. 49. 78. 84. 98

Unknown tongue, Service in, 14

Gilbert & Rivington, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

REMARKS

ON THE

PROSPECTIVE AND PAST BENEFITS

OF

Cathedral Institutions,

ETC. ETC.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

A Sermon,

PREACHED AT THE CONSECRATION

OF

GROVE CHURCH

ON

TUESDAY, AUGUST 14, 1832.

REMARKS

ON THE

PROSPECTIVE AND PAST BENEFITS

OF

Cathedral Institutions,

IN THE

PROMOTION OF SOUND RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

AND OF

CLERICAL EDUCATION.

BY EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, B.D.,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

" For Deans and Canons, or Prebends of Cathedral Churches, they were of great use in the Church."—Bacon.

" Is there no mean to train and nurse up Ministers? for the yield of the Universities will not serve, though they were never so well governed; to train them, I say, not to preach, for that every man confidently adventureth to do, but to preach soundly, and to handle the Scriptures with wisdom and judgment?"—Id.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

ROAKE AND VARTY, 31, STRAND;

J. H. PARKER, OXFORD;

AND

J. AND J. J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE.

1833.

PREFACE

TO

THE SECOND EDITION.

In committing the following remarks for the second time to the press, I am especially anxious to prevent misconception, as to the extent of the object proposed in them. For, notwithstanding any protests which may be made, the defender of a cause will generally be supposed to intend, at least, to occupy all the ground which he thinks tenable; and those points, accordingly, which he overlooks or fails to cover, are regarded as being tacitly abandoned. I wish, therefore, to state the more explicitly, that I intend, in the following pages, mainly to consider one portion only of the vast and important subjects connected with our Cathedral Institutions; the services, namely, which they have and may render to the Church, in the promotion of sound theology and of clerical education. I could not, indeed, but incidentally glance at other good ends which they have realized, whenever their preferment has

been honestly bestowed; and I have, on the present occasion, adverted to these a little more fully than before. Yet, the Cathedral, of which I am a member, having in some respects a peculiar character, as being connected with a collegiate foundation, and my own professional duties being exclusively those of a theological teacher, the very circumstances which appeared to give me an advantage in considering the theological uses of Cathedrals, would also prevent my becoming acquainted personally with those of their benefits, which are more directly practical. I do not, therefore, attempt to consider at length the complex uses of Cathedral Institutions, in relation to the state of the Church and of society. Neither did it fall into this plan to consider at any length the rights of property and of trusts, involved in any change of the destination of Cathedral property; although it is manifestly of the utmost importance that we should, in these days, have definite and distinct notions upon the subject, and to these notions adhere uncompromisingly,—that not only should we not yield one jot or tittle of *right* to any *expediency*, however apparently pressing, but that we should take heed that our very views of right be

not unconsciously warped by a reference to expediency,—that our rule of right be not crooked, the light to guide us be not darkened.

The object, then, of the following remarks lies within a narrow compass. In every portion of the Christian name, ever since learning became essential to the Church, there have been institutions corresponding more or less to the Cathedral foundations of this country; every where there have been institutions to further the education and instruction of the Clergy, and to provide for the maintenance of theological learning. In our own country, these have in some measure survived. In most other Protestant lands, the greedy selfishness of former politicians has absorbed their revenues. Institutions, however, corresponding to these were found necessary; and thus imposts were to be laid upon each nation, to accomplish that which might have been secured to them gratuitously. The abolition of our Cathedral Institutions would leave us destitute of a provision enjoyed, in some measure, by all other members of the Christian family, Protestant, Greek, or Romanist; it were to renew an experiment, which has been already tried and been found pernicious. A Parochial Clergy has

not been found any where capable of discharging, unassisted, all the duties of a Christian ministry.

With regard to the particular mode in which I think that the efficiency of Cathedral establishments might be increased, and a grievous practical evil, the want of means for clerical education, might at the same time be removed, I have purposely abstained from giving any definite plan. Such objections as I have heard made to the plan in general, I have endeavoured to obviate; but its details would, I am convinced, be adjusted with most wisdom and discretion, by those whose office it is to consult for our common benefit—the Bishops of our Church. I should think that what to me appeared advantages, were ill purchased by any step which might bear the semblance of encroaching upon their high duties and office.

In speaking of the prospective necessity of Cathedral, or some similar institutions, I was led unavoidably to remark on some portion of the benefits which these have already rendered; and no more convenient mode suggested itself by which these might compendiously be exhibited, than to examine how much of the theology, which we to this day enjoy, was produced by, or in connection

with, them. I was, I own, myself astonished, upon examination, to observe how name after name of those whose memory we cherish, connected itself with these institutions, until at last scarcely any were left among our earlier divines (and those in the evil times of the rebellion), which were not fostered either by our Cathedral, or, in some few exceptions, by our Collegiate institutions. My object, in the first instance, was to mention those names only with which most persons would be, in some measure, familiar, in order that they might themselves judge of the use of these foundations, when they saw contained within their compass almost all the names which they have been accustomed to revere. To this mere selection of names, however, there appeared to be two objections; the one, that it might be thought that the names of these great men were accidentally only enrolled on the lists of our Cathedrals, but that the preferment itself was not instrumental in the production of their works; the other, that the eye glances rapidly over a catalogue of names, and forms but an imperfect estimate of the numbers therein mentioned. To obviate this, I have, on the present occasion, formed a Chronological Table of 108 Divines; 8

of whom only were exclusively members of Colleges, the 100 were members of Cathedrals; and I have added to each (wherever it could be ascertained) the age at which he obtained his first Cathedral preferment, and under what circumstances his chief writings were produced. Professional employments not allowing me, at the present time, the leisure for going again into the detailed histories of these great men, I have obtained the facts, upon which I have framed these tables, through the zealous kindness of my accurate and indefatigable young friend and pupil, the Rev. Benjamin Harrison, Student of Christ Church, who has also provided me with some of the other notices introduced in the course of the remarks. Of his faithfulness, the reader may be entirely satisfied. The question about the instrumentality of the Cathedrals in producing these works, is thus entirely set at rest. For the other point, any *selection* must, in its own nature, give an inadequate and imperfect representation. With the same ease with which these hundred names have been given, another century of them could have been added; and the list must even then have remained imperfect. For, what an unreasonable requisition were it, that all

the Divines, who in their age have benefited the Church, should have been writers, and all have written for our age as well as for their own! Or in what other profession would it be supposed that the names of all those, who, in their generation, served God and promoted the welfare of mankind, would, in all subsequent ages, be in the mouth of all the people? Would such a test be applied to any other branch of duty? Let any one consider how many statesmen he can recal to mind, in any portion of history, which he has not made his especial study, and think whether he would conceive it fair, to argue that these alone were they who devoted their time to the well-being of the nation, that the only public worth is that which common history records.

I ask men, in deciding on this grave question, to look but to evidence. If they see a presumption in favour of Cathedrals, in the fact that almost all the theology transmitted to us is derived from them; that, under God, we owe our Liturgy to them, our beautiful and holy translation of the Scriptures to them and to our Collegiate foundations,—then, for the rest, let them either examine for themselves, or let them take the word of those

who have examined, that these are but a portion only of that noble host, who,—when patronage was honestly bestowed, "as a trust for the good of the Church of God, for which strict account was to be given,"*—did good service to religious wisdom and holiness.

* Nelson's Life of Bull, (of Lord Chancellor Finch.)

REMARKS

UPON

CATHEDRAL INSTITUTIONS,

&c. &c.

In times of excitement, like the present, when every one seems to be discovering for himself some defect in existing institutions, and every one also is eager to apply his own remedy, those who consult their own reputation, or desire their own peace, will generally abstain from intermeddling in these questions. It is indeed probable that we shall suffer more from our physicians than from our ills. For while no one appears contented either with the present state of things, or with the remedies proposed by others, people seem to be agreed in this only, that the more desperate the remedy, or the greater the change in the present system, the more likely it is to be beneficial. Men seem to have awakened as out of a trance, and as if to make up for their former inactivity, and to regain the lost time, they propose to remedy in a few days the effects of the negligence of years.

Caution or hesitation in adopting extreme measures is regarded as equivalent to lukewarmness: expedition is the only criterion of zeal or earnestness. Meantime none of these writers on Church Reform seem to have turned their minds, either to the circumstances of other churches, or to the former condition of our own; and maxims are regarded as axiomatic, which any acquaintance with either of these portions of history would shew to be dangerous and fallacious. Thus, it is assumed, either that a learned Clergy are altogether unnecessary, or that at all events it will suffice if a few individuals devote themselves to theological study: or, on the other hand, that Clergy engaged in the active duties of their profession, can possess themselves of all the learning necessary for every purpose of the Church. Higher degrees of learning are looked upon as belonging rather to the show or the luxuries or the ornaments of the Church than to her well-being: if a Church be rich enough to afford these superfluities, it is well; but if not, and they are in consequence removed, then it is well also. Because, again, other Protestant Churches have no Cathedral endowments, it is assumed, that they have no corresponding Institutions for the maintenance and supply of a learned Clergy; whence it is to follow, that if the Chapters were abolished, we should be just as advantageously circumstanced, as every other portion of the Protestant body.

Nor is this the only case in which persons are led away by names, from examining into the realities of things. When any thing has been often abused, it is inferred that it must always be so; its very name condemns it, even where the abuse is precluded. Thus, a sinecure, in the strict sense of the term, i. e. an office which may be held without any responsibility, and without having, in any sort, tangible duties to perform, were undoubtedly an evil. It is not a healthful condition for any man (much less for one, who by his ordination vows has pledged himself to the performance of practical duties,) to remain without any duties to perform; and it cannot be necessary or useful for any institution to have such members within it. But it is most commonly forgotten that the evil lies, in the existence, not of *sinecures*, but of *sinecurists*. For if there be real labour bestowed, and real service performed, it matters little in what way the person so labouring be supported. A sinecure annexed to an active office, or bestowed upon an active labourer, who is otherwise inadequately provided for, becomes in fact the provision for that office and those exertions; nor can it be worth while to make extensive alterations for the sake of a name only. The possession of a sinecure then does not imply a Sinecurist; and yet the vulgar error now seems to be, that, because Cathedral Stalls are nearly sinecures, therefore, all who hold them are necessarily Sinecurists. How many, or how few

such there be, will now soon be ascertained. Again, it is said, and truly, that our Church has been a learned Church, or, more truly, that it has been adorned by individuals, who to deep piety have added the profoundest learning ; but persons have not inquired by what institutions this learning was fostered, or whether we now, actually as well as in name, possess the same advantages. Still less does any one seem to inquire, whether there be any *right* to make the alterations proposed. On the one hand, they set forth the neglected state of our large towns, or our mining districts, or our scattered agricultural population ; on the other, insulated, or at all events incidental, abuses in the appointments to our large Cathedral establishments ; and without further inquiry into the justice of the case, it is thought that a double benefit would be conferred upon the Church, by providing for the one, through the extinction of the other.

Yet, if man would ever learn, every extensive portion of history might shew, how dearly each advantage, obtained by a departure from strict right, had been purchased : how surely, in the end, each preference of expediency had entailed evils proportionate to the extent of the deviation. It would seem superfluous to say, that, least of all, could a holy cause be advanced by unholy means ; that in the promotion of Christ's kingdom, we should, on the very ground that the end is so overwhelmingly great, be the more rigidly jealous about

the strict propriety of the means, had not the contrary principles been too often exemplified;—as if the greatness of the object could alter the character of actions, or as if God willed that man's salvation should be promoted by the breaking of His laws. The utmost that we can do in conformity with God's will, we are bound to do: yet we may not think that God's arm is so shortened, that He needs our injustice to accomplish the objects of His holiness and love.

The author of these pages long wished and hoped that others more deeply versed in the early history of our Church, or more qualified by age, authority, or experience, would have undertaken the task of setting these questions in their right light. None such,* however, came forward; and the opinion of the uselessness of Cathedral Institutions, and the expediency of their abolition, being uncontradicted, has been adopted as self-evident among many of the writers on Church Reform. Agreement in this one point has united in an unnatural alliance persons who have no other principles in common. It appeared to me, therefore, a duty to set forth such of the important purposes which these institutions either might serve, or had already served, as the peculiar circumstances in which Providence had placed me, had led me especially to consider. Others there are, and those neither few nor unim-

* When the above was published, Archdeacon Butler's "Thoughts on Church Dignities" had not yet appeared.

portant, which, on the same ground, I felt myself the less qualified to appreciate; the less definite namely, but still substantial advantages, which their existence may render either to their immediate neighbourhood, or to society in general; and that, either directly, or indirectly by benefits immediately resulting to the Clergy. In all these several ways, as far as patronage has been rightly exercised, they have rendered services not the less real, because incapable of a precise calculation; a conscientious discharge of *patronage* is alone needed in order to restore to these establishments their full efficiency, and to obtain greater benefits, than any which their funds could yield, by any other application, even if they might without injustice be otherwise appropriated.

In their own Cathedral towns, the influence of the members of these bodies is the less likely to be impeded, on the very ground that they are but incidentally connected with it. Being removed from local interests and parties, they may, on that account, exercise, whenever needed, a less obnoxious, and therefore more effectual influence. Their aid, accordingly, has often been very beneficially employed in the right management of the various benevolent institutions, of which they are in part trustees. Although, moreover, voluntary efforts will never *replace* regular and appointed exertions, yet they will in many cases be the more effectual, because voluntary.

The members of our Cathedrals having, *during the period of their residence*, few *prescribed* duties, may often render many important services, for which the Parochial Clergy of those places have little leisure, or may aid in giving a Christian tone to the intercourse of society, where the Parochial Clergy have little access, or might not be equally regarded. Nor is the advantage of an additional Church,* with a succession of well appointed ministers, to be despised, when we consider the inadequacy of provision for Divine worship in all our large towns. Thus the term of comparative rest allowed to a succession of men, who are otherwise laboriously employed elsewhere, provides, in each of these establishments, for an additional Church.

Nor again is the very magnificence of many of these institutions without its use. We are all impressed through our outward senses more than we would willingly admit. Granted, for a while, that these institutions were luxuries in religion, shall

* Lord Henley, indeed, (Plan, p. 35) speaks of "the effectual exclusion of the poor by the arrangements of the very small portion of the vast edifice, which is applied to the real business of worship." I know not to what cases he alludes; but I know, without particular inquiry, that Rochester, Hereford, Exeter, Wells, Bristol, Gloucester, Lichfield, Worcester, Salisbury, have large and *regular* congregations, and so, I presume, have others. Part of the Cathedral of Chester has actually been separated off into a Parish Church. The early weekly service at Exeter, being at a convenient hour, is attended, as I am informed, by an average congregation of 50 persons daily.

the service of God be the only service without magnificence?* We measure not with exact scrupulosity the proportions of expense or outward show in things which we really value or exult in. It is well that we should, in outward actions also, testify our value of things spiritual: the expression of our feelings strengthens them: when we have reduced the indications of those feelings by any utilitarian

* Hooker beautifully expresses himself on this head. "The Prophet David doth mention a natural conveniency, which such kind of bounteous expenses have, as well for that we do thereby give unto God a testimony of our cheerful affection, which thinketh nothing too dear to be bestowed about the furniture of his service, as also because it serveth to the world for a witness of his Allmightiness, whom we outwardly honour with the chiefest of outward things, as being of all things himself incomparably the greatest. Besides, were it not also strange, if God should have made such store of glorious creatures on earth, and leave them all to be consumed in secular vanity, allowing none but the baser sort to be employed in his own service?" Eccl. Pol. B. v. c. 15. And Bishop Stillingfleet: "Granting that all which is merely necessary to salvation may be had in Parochial Churches, yet must those, who profess themselves Christians, look at nothing in the worship of God beyond what is plainly necessary? It can never be proved necessary to salvation to have Parochial Churches well built, or decent pulpits or pews in them, or to go to those Churches in a more orderly dress than they sit in at home, or to have their Psalms set to the best tunes, or to have their Bibles handsomely bound: yet there is such a becoming decency in these things, as argues that what relates to God and his worship ought to have something above what is barely necessary. For to give God no more than just what is necessary, is as if we thought we had a hard bargain of it when we were required to serve him." Eccl. Cases, P. ii. pp. 570, 1.

standard, it is to be feared that the principles themselves will have lost much of the principle of life. The leaves of the forest-tree may seem but an idle luxuriance; yet he, who would amend this apparent prodigality of nature, would gain little by his thriftiness.

The benefits, again, of the gradations of clerical rank, afforded by our Cathedrals, are not confined to these towns themselves. These stations have been, they are in some degree, and may at any time, by a conscientious employment of *patronage*, again be made, orders of merit. They have been, and may again be, a stamp of honour, bearing testimony to those selected for this dignity, that they have approved themselves in the office to which they have been called. And who shall say, that it is unphilosophical, or unscriptural, to esteem titles or offices, given upon such grounds? or that patents of nobility, such as these, would not rightly and legitimately confer upon such as should merit them, additional influence among their clerical brethren, or upon society at large? Did then Cathedral institutions render no other service, the present arrangement by which the annexation of Cathedral preferment to parochial duties, provides for the minister a period of comparative rest, during his residence at the Cathedral, and on his return to the scene of his labours, confers upon him an increased weight, would be preferable to one, whose only object would be to provide an adequate income.

Since, moreover, it is desirable that the recreations of the Clergy should partake of the character of their profession, it were a peculiarly happy circumstance, that the refreshment, which all would allow to be necessary, should in these cases be directly connected with their habits and duties ;—that an exchange of employment has been made equally serviceable with entire rest. Few probably there have been, upon whom, at some period, and under some circumstances, the pure and holy harmony of the choral service has not produced an impression for which they have felt grateful. It is then not difficult to imagine, what must be its refreshing, healing, strengthening, purifying influence to those, who return to it after periods of labour and exhaustion :* or how salutary it has been in awakening the first feelings of devotion in many, who had been but too seldom attracted to religious services of any kind; or how edifying it may be to many, to whom it has always been the natural expression of devotion.

With regard, lastly, to the Clergy generally, it might be pointed out at length, of what advantage a gradation of rank is in every order of men, provided that gradation be formed upon right princi-

* I may be permitted to refer to the case of a valuable clerical friend, who tells me that the period of his residence at his Cathedral, is to him, *spiritually*, the best portion of the whole year. On this part of the subject, I would wish any one to read the eloquent and impressive language of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his last Charge, 1832, p. 20, sqq.

ples. Nor, if the members of these bodies should again be selected with reference only to piety, learning, and experience, can it be doubted, that, as Assistants* to the Bishop in such offices as he might depute to them, they might aid in maintaining a wholesome discipline. They might add to the *virtual* authority of the Bishop by tempering the appearance of arbitrariness, which men are wont to fasten upon the salutary acts of one individual; or, if need were, they might diminish, by sharing it, the odium attached to the performance of duty.

These subjects require, indeed, a distinct and detailed discussion, and must be taken into account by any one who would understand the several bearings and the real value of these Institutions. Hoping

* "I shall next allege that which is the genuine and proper use of Cathedral Churches, that for which they were primarily instituted; that is, that the Deans and Chapters should be the Council of the Bishop, to assist him in his jurisdiction and greatest censures, if any thing be amiss either in the doctrine or in the manners of the Clergy. It is not to be denied that Ignatius, Cyprian, Hierom, Austin, and others, have required that some grave and discreet Presbyters should be *Senatus Episcopi*, and be advisers with him in his Consistory. But it seemeth strange to me, that when this reformation is called for, the Corporations of Deans and Chapters should be cried down, who were employed in this work by very antient institution. What Canonist is there that doth not refer us unto them for this service especially?" Bishop (then Dr.) Hacket's Speech before the House of Commons, p. xxi.—Bishop Stillingfleet discusses the same subject with his usual learning; Eccles. Cases, P. ii. p. 564, sqq. See also Thorndike's Primitive Government of Churches, c. 14.

that they may be taken up at full length, by one qualified to estimate them, I wish to confine myself to one, although indeed a very important, portion of the subject, and to consider their advantages or capabilities solely as means of promoting the theological learning necessary for any Church.

In making these observations, I would wish to advance nothing positively or dogmatically; I would only speak, as one engaged in the office of theological education, who have myself experienced the advantages of regular theological instruction, and have had frequent occasions of observing, in this country, the difficulties and perplexities resulting from its neglect, but have also remarked the evils, as well as the benefits, resulting from the system of foreign Protestant Churches. If I could see any reason to fear, that these observations would in any way add to the present ferment, or did not hope that they might, in their own slight degree, assist to allay it, or induce other persons to take up more effectually the ground upon which I have entered, I would gladly have held my peace.*

Upon a large portion of the subject of Church

* Against the suspicion of interested motives, I need scarcely vindicate myself. The plan to which I object, scarcely affects the Cathedral to which I belong: on the other hand, the improvement of the poorer livings entrusted to our patronage, which may fairly be required of these institutions, if preserved, must necessarily involve more or less personal sacrifice.

Reform it is, obviously, at present premature to speak: our knowledge both of the actual provision for the religious instruction of our people, and of the deficiencies of that provision, and again, of the extent of the income by which it is proposed to supply them, is notoriously very insufficient for any extensive calculations. But the present question lies within a narrower compass. If either justice, or necessity, or utility, require that our present institutions should be retained, then, those other wants, which ought undoubtedly to be provided for, must be met in some other way: we must not have a sort of composition for the necessities of the nation, or, like distressed and needy traders, seek to satisfy, for a time, one set of demands, by sacrificing the just and rightful claims of another.

The present reformers of the Church appear to have begun at the wrong end. Our first object ought not to be, to ascertain how much one might by any possibility curtail, but how much one ought to retain; what offices the good estate of the Church demands, if not in their present, at least in some kindred form; what duties, in fact, besides those of the parochial Clergy and of Episcopal superintendance, are required for the healthful condition of the Church.

Should any offices be found, upon examination, to be incapable of being connected with efficient duties, or of being rendered of real service, they might at all times better be dispensed with: the

application of their funds to the furtherance of practical religion (regard being always had to the objects proposed by the founder), as it would be a bounden duty, so also would it be a great and beneficial change. Before, however, we proceed to demolish any old institutions, it will be wise first to examine, not merely whether they are, or have been, of use, proportionate to what might fairly have been expected of them, (although on this ground also there is very much to urge,) nor whether the income appropriated to their support might, if directed to other purposes, be employed more beneficially than it has hitherto been in these; but whether there are services, which might by their means, if only rightly employed, be accomplished more efficiently than by any other; whether there are any duties left for them to discharge. For, although there may every where be some institutions which have so outlived the purposes for which they were erected, that they could not readily, in themselves, be converted to any practical end, yet, in the vast majority of cases, it will be found very practicable and easy to adapt them to the circumstances of the time; reanimating, instead of destroying. As, then, in the former case, it is better altogether to remove what is incapable of amelioration, so, in the latter, it will be advisable to retain whatever in its present form is capable of use. For changes, which are in appearance the slightest, are often the most

efficient; and old institutions, if adapted to new duties, generally glide more readily into them, and are fitted to them with less expenditure of labour, and less risk of experiment or mistake. The massive buildings of our ancestors, although, perhaps, too stately for our utilitarian habits, can yet be more readily formed into a modern and convenient mansion, as assuredly also into a more durable one, than if we were first to level the mighty fabric to the dust, and then erect a new edifice on its base. In a word, the less violence is done to the habits of men, the less sudden the transition, the more stable, probably, will be the new institutions, and the more real and effective the change produced.

I would propose then in the following pages, to make some observations, I. on the prominent evils arising from our neglect of clerical education; II. on the evil and the good to be found in the system of foreign Protestant Churches; III. on the eminent advantages which our Cathedral Institutions possess for carrying on a sound and practical theological education; and, IV. on the services which they have already afforded to our Church, in the one point of the rich theological treasures which they have produced. I would then venture some remarks, V. on the *right* of abolishing these Institutions; and, VI. on what might be fairly required of them for the spiritual benefit of the places from which their income is derived.

I. It is a very remarkable peculiarity in this country, that the wants elsewhere provided for by the state, are here mostly supplied by private benevolence. Not only have all the provisions for the poor, the sick, and indeed for every bodily and mental infirmity, been made by individual liberality, but almost the whole business of education, from the dames' or the Sunday School to the Universities—our national, our grammar, our collegiate schools—have been provided by individual munificence. Kings, indeed, and Queens, have contributed their share to our University or Collegiate foundations, but they have done so, as individuals, not as the rulers of the state. An annual sum, not amounting to 1000*l.** and of late somewhat grudgingly dispensed between the two Universities, is the only contribution which the state furnishes, or has furnished, for the purposes of English education. This peculiarity has indeed been attended with great and important advantages. Private charity does more good to its authors, and the habit of contributing individually to purposes elsewhere provided for by the state has probably had no little influence in forming the character of benevolence, by which a large body of our nation has been eminently distinguished. And

* The two Universities, meanwhile, *pay to* the state, for their privileges, about 3000*l.* a year each. Göttingen alone, independently of its library, costs the government of Hanover, as I am informed, about 14,000*l.* yearly.

although we are now in most respects enjoying the benefits of sacrifices made by our ancestors, and must take good heed lest we think highly of ourselves for that wherein we are the almoners only of their bounty; there is yet enough required, in all these several ways, to foster in an eminent degree the same spirit. A national defect has been made the occasion of individual improvement. Still such a state of things must, of necessity, have this disadvantage, that the efforts thus made will be unsystematic, and that, consequently, there will be much danger of incompleteness or want of regularity, where these are most necessary. Thus it has been, to say the least, a capricious, and doubtless also an injurious arrangement, that the preliminary education at the one University, until of late, consisted almost exclusively of mathematical, at the other, of classical studies: acuteness was mainly fostered at the one, moral judgment at the other; and each, by admitting in part the system of the other, has confessed that their plan was before too narrow. Greater evil has, however, been produced by the changes incident to the institutions themselves, occasioned by the varying habits, manners, and requirements of different times: for, the results being produced not by any regular system, but by the combination of separate efforts, any portion of the whole might be the more easily disarranged, without the cause of the defect becoming immediately perceptible. Thus, had there been at our

Universities, as at the German, a regular system of medical, theological, and legal instruction carried on under the inspection of the state, no change could have taken place, and no branch have been omitted, without its being immediately perceived. Our institutions having more a private character, and having furnished rather facilities for each branch of study, than a systematic education for any, they have all gradually passed away, and the preparatory education has alone been left, without this change attracting any notice, or calling forth any exertions to replace the provisions which have been withdrawn.

It is not necessary here to enter into a detailed inquiry how this took place; or how our Universities, from having been the teachers of all species of knowledge, and the nurseries of all practical science, have been brought down to the humble, though still most useful, office of providing an education introductory to all. Human sciences have been the gainers by this change. Law and medicine being alike taught practically in this country, can be better communicated in the neighbourhood of the courts of law, or of the vast receptacles of sick, with which our metropolis abounds, than they could have been at the Universities; and these have rendered to the nation the best service, which, as Universities, they could render, in that they have prepared both heart and mind, in the manner the most effective, for whatever

duties of life each might subsequently be called upon to discharge. They have formed neither lawyers, nor physicians, nor statesmen; but they have trained the mind, and disciplined the intellect, and schooled the heart, so that those whom they sent forth should grapple with any subject which might subsequently be presented to them, with an enlightened judgment and a discerning understanding. The general student has been benefited by a delay of his peculiar studies until a period, when his mind may have attained the requisite power and compass. The risk of being unduly narrowed, to which the mind is at all times exposed by the exclusive study of a single science, is in a great degree diminished by the liberal and unconfined character of the previous cultivation.

There are probably no circumstances under which the study of the nobler professions can be more advantageously approached, the public benefit so greatly promoted, and the particular sciences more really advanced, than when minds, accustomed to an extensive survey, their powers of combination quickened, and their acuteness of discrimination refined, shall concentrate those powers on a single branch of human knowledge. There may be inferior provinces, where no such preparation is required, and for which habits of accuracy, diligence and faithfulness may alone suffice; and in these, as minds of no great compass are re-

quired, exclusive employment on a narrow field may be of public benefit, with no great individual detriment: in the higher branches, the interests of the public and those of the individual coincide; and whatever enlarges and strengthens and consolidates the mind of the individual, renders him a fitter instrument for public usefulness.

These more general advantages of our Universities the Clergy also share, nor is it a slight advantage that their habits and powers of thinking are formed in the same way with those of other educated men; that they are, until a certain point, trained up in contact with those whom they are afterwards to influence; and that the peculiarities of habits and of manners, which, on a more contracted plan of education, might impede or dull that influence, are, as far as may be, prevented. I rejoice that an education has been formed, calculated alike for the Christian layman, and for those who are afterwards to be ministers of Christ. Whatever previous training, whatever discipline of the heart and understanding, whatever schooling of the affections or expansion of the whole mind and spirit, may be required for the right cultivation of the human sciences, must be much more necessary when the things hereafter to be handled are, in a more especial sense, the things of God. Nay, were it necessary to make the choice, even more good may probably be expected to result, by God's blessing, from such previous formation of

the mind, than from any mere imparting of theological knowledge. But there is in truth no need for such a choice. In other sciences, where the benefits resulting from sound knowledge are tangible to sense, we do not content ourselves with a self-taught or empiric acquisition of them; we entrust not any person with the management of our bodily health, however cultivated his mind or enlarged his understanding, unless, under judicious guidance, he have studied the science which he professes. In the profession of the Christian minister, the case is the more urgent, not only on account of the greater interests at stake, but because, by the present system at least, he does not engage in his duties under the direction of another; he does not, like the physician or lawyer, enter upon some subordinate or secondary office in which his own inexperience might be corrected by another's knowledge; but he is, very frequently, at once entrusted with an office as important as any which may be committed to him during his whole life; and for the right discharge of this, he is left, as far as man is concerned, unaided and uninstructed, and his errors unremedied. Yet I need not say, that the diseases of the soul are more various and manifold than those of the body; that the constitution of the mind, in its endless shades of difference, must be as diligently studied as that of the body; that spirit requires to be more delicately handled than our material frames; and so

much the more, in that the diseased in body long for a cure, and will undergo hardship to obtain it, *they* will cut off the right hand or foot: the spiritually diseased love their sickness, and part with no portion of the malady which they dare retain.

Yet for this momentous office, all the provision which is made by the University, is the very same instruction which is given to all its other Members, whatever their future destination may be: the University, as such, does not in this stage of its instruction, recognize any distinction between the different classes of its students; nor could it do so, without foregoing the advantages resulting from the preliminary discipline of the mind. All the provision then made for the future Minister of God's Word, before he leaves the University, is that same degree of Christian knowledge which is thought requisite (and rightly so) for every cultivated Member of a Christian state. The very circumstance, indeed, that the instruction given is thus common to all, has secured to the Christian layman a larger portion of religious teaching, than would probably have been allowed to him, had the studies of the several professions branched off at an earlier period. At least, in foreign countries, where the theological instruction at the Universities is strictly professional, those destined for other employments very rarely attend it; and the grievous defect of the absence of any general

Christian instruction adapted for the layman, although very sensibly felt by the religious sovereign of Prussia, has not, as yet, been remedied. For a *general* Christian education then, not only are the subjects prescribed by our statutes, and which consequently form the basis of the College lectures, as ample as is probably required, but our system in this respect stands advantageously distinguished above that of modern Christian Churches. Every student is required to obtain some knowledge of the evidences of our holy religion, of the Gospels in the original, and of the history of the Acts and of the older dispensation, and, lastly, of the doctrines of our Faith, as set forth in our Articles, and proved out of Holy Scripture. Nor is the instruction in these subjects imparted superficially, or inadequately to the objects proposed. The details indeed, or the degree of its excellence, must vary according to the powers, the knowledge, the experience, the Christian insight, possessed by the several persons, upon whom the duty of imparting it may in each College devolve, or upon the different depth of the books, which may, in each society, be recommended for the private study of the several subjects.

To such variations every institution must be liable, nor do they in any degree affect the main question. Neither incidental merits, nor occasional defects, are to be taken into account, in

estimating the character of an entire system. On the whole, there is every reason to be satisfied both with the extent of the subjects upon which instruction is given, and with the degree of that instruction. The defect lies, not in the system itself, but in that this system is virtually applied to purposes, for which it was not intended: that an education ample, as elementary instruction, for the Christian layman, has been deemed sufficient for the Minister of Christ: that one and the same system has been thought adequate for him who is hereafter to be further instructed, and for him who is to convey that instruction,—for him, "whose lips are to keep knowledge," and for him, "who is to seek the law at his mouth."

The instruction given at the age in question must probably remain in great measure elementary and introductory; it can never embrace that fuller knowledge, requisite for the high office of interpreting God's ways and God's will. Had persons, when they enter the University, laid a better foundation for a profitable study of Theology than they generally have, or rather, were the very foundation of all religious knowledge not, too often, here first to be laid; it would still, generally speaking, be very unadviseable, at a period when the mind is as yet so little formed, to attempt to pursue the subjects of Theology, in the mode and the degree in which they are required for the discharge of the ministerial office. The instruction

in Theology ought to commence, where it now in most cases ends, after the preliminary education is completed. Yet all the theological *instruction* which the future minister of the Gospel *need* add to the elementary acquirements of the layman, is to be derived from attending one short course of twelve lectures from the Regius Professor of Divinity, consisting for the most part of a general survey of the different subjects of Theology, and a recommendation of those books by which the Student may most conveniently pursue the subjects for himself. One fortnight now comprises the beginning and the end of all the public instruction which any candidate for Holy Orders is *required* to attend previously to entering upon his profession; and the benefit to be derived from this is probably in all cases much diminished, in many nearly neutralized, by the newness of the students to the subjects proposed to them. In most cases, they carry off some few important but insulated principles, rather than any distinct idea, what they are to study, or how to study it.

There is, indeed, in either University, additional instruction open to such as choose to avail themselves of it. In our own, lectures on the Articles are read from time to time by the Margaret Professor of Divinity; in the private lectures of the Regius Professor, the Epistles, and the early ecclesiastical history may be studied with every advantage: lectures in the Old Testament in its original

language, adapted to each stage in the progress of the students, are likewise constantly given. Those, however, who do actually avail themselves of these advantages are comparatively few; and fewer those who perseveringly attend any *course* of Theological instruction: the great majority of the candidates for orders reside only for the single fortnight, during which they are obliged to attend the public lectures of the Divinity Professor; and with the chart with which he furnishes them, and some earnest admonitions as to the importance of the high office, to which they trust that they are called, they are dismissed to pilot themselves and those committed to them, through a narrow and difficult passage, beset by shoals on the right hand and on the left. There are indeed exceptions; the sons of Clergymen may occasionally, doubtless, be happily initiated by their parents, at once into the practical and more scientific portions of their profession. Some few others may obtain instruction by residing as pupils with their elder brethren; but this is naturally beyond the means of most candidates for orders: our Fellowships, again, such at least as are not absorbed by the duties of tuition, furnish a degree of leisure to some others. The majority, however, confine their preparation to the private and unaided study of such books as the Bishop or the Professor, or some older clerical friend, may recommend. There being, moreover, no general provision for theological education, the

Bishops have been compelled to lower the standard of qualifications below what they themselves think desirable; and the standard being thus lowered, there is no sufficient *external* stimulus to those who *have* opportunities of fuller instruction. It is, indeed, probable that the magnitude of this evil is in some measure diminished in detached cases; that many individuals, who have already in mind devoted themselves to their future profession, knowing how few opportunities they shall hereafter have of obtaining Biblical instruction, avail themselves to a greater degree, than the rest, of that which is furnished in the ordinary College lectures; and abstract from their preliminary studies, all which is not absolutely required for their final University examination. But this is a mere palliative: it indicates the craving after better sustenance, the sense, that something more is needed for the momentous office to which God has called us, than what the ordinary routine even of a Christian education can supply; it evinces the natural repugnance to go forth to a conflict so difficult with weapons which have not been proved. Yet the anxiety of the student to adopt any expedient by which he may supply what the present state of things, or the *res angusta domi*, precludes him from anticipating at any future time, can be no ground for furnishing him with this meagre provision only: his readiness to avail himself of an inadequate instruction can be no

reason for denying the fuller knowledge which he requires. It is at all times a difficult task in early life, to persuade one's self that one can be better employed upon sciences, either abstract in themselves, or which have no direct connexion with one's future great destination, than upon those subjects which bear immediately upon it, and appear to qualify one for its duties. And if this be so, when the professional studies are only delayed, how much more when that delay involves their abandonment. But this is the least evil: the great mischief of the system is, that even the knowledge thus acquired must needs be elementary: it is imparted at an age which requires elementary instruction: it is imparted alike to those who are to guide, and those who are to be guided. The utmost which any one can thus acquire, is the foundation of his own right conduct, the strengthening of his own principles, the grounding of his own faith; not what is requisite to correct the faith or confirm the principles of others. He may, by God's blessing, have laid a good foundation for himself: but he is not yet in a condition to build up others.

I will not willingly exaggerate any thing, nor would I attach an undue importance to the *knowledge* even of divine things. Every Christian must be assured, that without the Spirit of Christ, learning, as well as every other good gift of God, will become a snare to its possessor; that, unless it be consecrated to God's service it must of necessity

be profaned; that one may understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and yet be but as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. Yet while we lay to heart this great truth, we must not allow ourselves so to be absorbed by it, as to forget that other truth, that "every teacher *well instructed unto the kingdom of heaven*, is like a man who is an householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old;" that he who aspires to the office of a Minister of Christ, must be "apt to teach;" that although, God be praised, such knowledge as is necessary for salvation is easy when imparted, it follows not, that it is equally easy to impart it.

In truth, arduous as the practical duties of the Clergy always are, even to the experienced, and difficult as it must be, under any system, to reduce into practice the principles or the instruction given in the abstract, the difficulties are increased a hundred fold, when the qualifications for the ministerial office are to be learned during the discharge of its duties. It is impossible for any person, who has not either himself entered thus unprepared into the office, or been frequently consulted by young Clergymen, to conceive the extent of perplexity and difficulty in which they are constantly plunged. New to every portion of their office, even the composition of a sermon or the duties of catechising, and new to their studies also, they are perpetually distracted between their

active duties, and the studies which may fit them to discharge those duties, and while engaged on the one, are dissatisfied that they are not occupied with the other. The single subject of the *mode* of studying the Holy Scriptures gives rise to embarrassments, of which no one, who has not commenced it unaided, can form any idea. The result, where most favourable, generally is, that many valuable years, in which, under right guidance, a solid and substantial progress might have been made, are employed in wandering from one subject to another, with little profit or satisfaction. This is the happiest case : and I never can forget the deep feeling with which, when entering on my theological studies, I was congratulated by eminent Clergy, who had themselves trod this difficult path, on the more royal road, which was then opened to myself and my contemporaries by the almost paternal kindness of the late excellent Bishop Lloyd. It was, indeed, an incalculable benefit, thus, at one's very outset, instead of a mere outline of the country, to have such a guide in the path which one was to pursue : and the wish that this blessing, whose value I have myself experienced, might be extended to others, is one great motive for putting forth these observations.

Other results of this want of preparation are more painful to dwell upon, but may not be passed over. Many, who might otherwise have adorned their profession, will now be content to

struggle through on the minimum, with which they can tolerably discharge its duties: others will underrate the greatness, and dignity, and responsibility of an office, for which little or no preparation was held to be necessary: others, again, destitute of professional employment for their leisure, will lapse into unclerical habits, or lessen their influence by unclerical occupations or amusements. I am aware that "theology* is rather a divine life than a divine knowledge:" but, in proportion as "want of occupation is the parent of all ill," so must the employment of men's leisure upon subjects connected with their calling be, of all secondary means, the best calculated to promote its diligent discharge: much more then, when those subjects, being in themselves holy, have a direct tendency to hallow the thoughts, the affections, and the desires.

These results of our neglected education would be a sore evil to the Church at all times, and under all circumstances: it would at all times be very pernicious to her, that her ministers should have to learn their duties empirically, while endeavouring to perform them, when the subject of their experiments is the souls of men: it would be very hurtful at all times, that many of them should enter upon their office, having but very little ground on which to rest their trust, that "they are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost," to un-

* Bishop Taylor's Sermon before the University of Dublin.

dertake an office whose duties they do not understand: it is a grievous ill, that her ministers should be exposed to prefer the world and the flesh to her holy duties, because they have not been adequately taught in what those duties consist.

But there are yet other evils peculiar to these times, which must of necessity ensue, if the education of our Clergy continue to be neglected, and which we therefore are especially bound to anticipate; the absence of an adequate correction to what is evil in the tendencies of our age, and the want of confidence in our Clergy.* The two characteristic

* "The studies and qualifications of the Clergy are forced onwards and upwards by that resistless pressure of intellect, which is urging every class of society upon the footsteps of that which is next above it; and if they do not yield to the impulse, or rather if they do not anticipate and prevent it, by the most strenuous efforts to maintain their relative position, and to prove themselves masters of the knowledge which the people *seek at their mouth*, they will discredit their order, and render their ministry ineffective, and endanger the Establishment; which, however it may be fenced by protecting laws, will cease to maintain its ancient ascendancy in the affections of the people, should it ever cease to be eminently useful. It will cease to be useful when its Clergy cease to be respected; and although it be true that a certain degree of respect will always be yielded to honest intentions and a holy life, yet since we are to be preachers and teachers, as well as doers of the word, we must not, in that capacity, *suffer any to despise us*, nor permit the cause of truth to be wounded through the sides of its incompetent defenders."—*Bishop of London's primary Charge*, where are also some valuable quotations from Archbishop Wake and Bishop Sanderson.

evils of our times are *excitement and superficialness*, either reproducing the other. Great progress has been made in the intellectual cultivation of one, perhaps of several portions of society; much fallow land has been broken up, and it may please God hereafter to make this also productive unto good. But the immediate effect of so sudden and rapid a change must, of necessity, be detrimental as well to the higher degrees of intellectual improvement, as to a sober state of feeling and a calm estimate of things. Mental cultivation has been widened, not deepened; nay, it cannot but be, that when the demand for popular or elementary instruction is suddenly increased, real and solid knowledge must be for the time diminished; those who would otherwise be employed in advancing the real study of each science, being almost necessarily diverted to supply immediate wants, and to exhibit, in a popular or attractive form, the results which have already been acquired. Man, meanwhile, mistakes the progress of those individuals who have increased in knowledge for the progress of knowledge itself; the bounds of human wisdom seem to him to be enlarged, because the boundary which precluded many from approaching it, has been thrown down: and indefinite expectations are raised of the future progress and the conquests of his race, because a portion of them have now for the first time surmounted obstacles, which separated *them* from their fellow-men. Positive advances may be meanwhile

made, but in subjects, in which advance does not imply elevation. The increase of the treasures open to us, does not increase our capacity for containing them; the enlarged knowledge of the facts of physical science leaves us still at an equal distance from the infinity which lies beyond, and equally incapable to grasp it. The habitual employment of our sight upon distant objects may accustom us to discern those objects more distinctly than other men, but it will not extend the range of human vision: nor will our increased acquaintance with results or effects, give us any more insight into their ultimate cause. At best we may discover a few more links of the golden chain, which, as Homer imagined, connected earthly things with heavenly; but that end which is attached to the throne of the Most High is still equally removed from us. Man, however, whether as an individual or as a body, especially when he is making progress of any sort, loves to dwell upon what he does, rather than upon what he does not know: and the period which elapses between the time when any new field is opened to him, and that when he again sees a limit placed before him, is one generally of undue excitement, and of feverish anticipation, and consequently one very unfavourable to the exercise of a sober judgment, as to the real extent of his faculties or his powers. "The sciences," says Pascal, "have two extremities, which coincide: the first is that state of pure ignorance, in

which we are by nature: the other extremity is that at which great minds arrive, which, having traversed every thing which man can know, discover that they know nothing, and recognise that they have arrived at that same ignorance from which they set out. But this is an intelligent ignorance, which knows itself. Those who have set out from the stage of natural ignorance, and have not yet been able to arrive at the other, have some tinge only of that real and adequate knowledge; and these are the assumers and pretenders to reason. These disquiet the world: and judge of every thing worse than others."* Unhappily for the present tranquillity of our nation, they are not now a few pedants only, but it is a large body of our people, who have set out from the stage of natural ignorance, and have not yet been able to arrive at the other; and the natural tendency is, if not, as Pascal says, that they should judge of every thing

* Pensées 1re Part. Art. vi. s. 25. I subjoin the inimitable original:—"Les sciences ont deux extrémités qui se touchent; la première est la pure ignorance naturelle où se trouvent tous les hommes en naissant. L'autre extrémité est celle où arrivent les grands âmes, qui, ayant parcouru tout ce que les hommes peuvent savoir, trouvent qu'ils ne savent rien, et se rencontrent dans cette même ignorance d'où ils étoient partis. Mais c'est une ignorance savante qui se connoit. Ceux qui sont sortis de l'ignorance naturelle, et n'ont pu arriver à l'autre, ont quelque teinture de cette science suffisante, et font les entendus. Ceux-là trou blent le monde, et jugent plus mal de tout que les autres."

worse than other men, that they are at least very ill judges of every thing, except the immediate subjects of their knowledge; of every thing, in short, which gives that knowledge its real value, by shewing its proportions and relations to other branches of knowledge. Above all, (for this is what, as Christians, we must mainly think of,) they will be very ill judges of Christianity. Accustomed to new discoveries, or (what is the same) to discoveries new to them, in different portions of human knowledge, they will expect the same in divine; and unless they be made acquainted with the real and true discoveries therein, the breadth and depth and length and height of the Christian dispensation, they will seek to themselves discoveries, which are not true, and expect that Christianity also must share in the advances of the age, and be remoulded in accordance with the requisitions of an enlightened period. In proportion, then, as every class of society advances in secular knowledge, or intellectual cultivation, in that degree do they themselves need a balance of increased religious knowledge: nor can their new wants be supplied without an enlarged compass of knowledge on the part of many of their spiritual instructors. Christianity is indeed the same at all times and in all countries, to Greek or to Barbarian, to bond or free; yet the same truths may be conveyed in different modes to the cultivated or the ignorant; there are different sorts of instruction calculated for

each ; there are different errors to which each is exposed, and against which each must be guarded.

Moreover, besides the positive benefits resulting from the nature of the instruction, it is of importance also that the nation shall have confidence in their instructors. For truth depends for its reception often much more on the character of him who enforces it, than on its own : and what, in the first preachers of the Gospel,* the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and the mighty works following them, were to the confirmation of the faith, such must now be a well-grounded knowledge of its evidences, and a deep insight into its nature.

The ill effects of the want of this confidence have already begun to appear in the misgivings expressed in some quarters, with regard to the conflict with German rationalism. I speak not of those who would wish to see it gain ground, or of those who sarcastically challenge us to enter into

* " Thus, in selecting those instruments which God employed for the dissemination of the faith, at the first he called men altogether unlearned and illiterate, except that they were instructed by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; and this, to set forth more evidently his own immediate and divine agency, and to put down all human wisdom. As soon, however, as this portion of his purpose was accomplished, in the times immediately succeeding, he sent forth into the world his own divine truth, accompanied by other sorts of learning as its attendants. And thus the pen of St. Paul, who alone of the Apostles was a learned man, was principally employed by God in the Scriptures of the New Testament."—*Bacon de Augment. Scient.* L. 1. p. 39.

these questions, in the hope that our defects may spoil a righteous cause, or may be the means of producing perplexity among our less instructed brethren. I would speak of men who, being convinced that "Rationalism is an idle theory," still apprehend that we have not "enough of that original erudition in which the foreign Professors excel," and who, therefore, "fear that the full effect of that idle theory upon English Christianity has not yet displayed itself."* Such fears are indeed founded on an exaggerated conception both of the might of German rationalism, and of the weakness of English theology: there are many amongst the English Clergy, who have examined every theory of German rationalism, and seen how untenable it is in its every position; and, if the interests of Christianity required it, they could prove it so to be. But to what purpose, to distract the attention from the goal at which we are to aim, by calling men back to the point from which they started? To what end, when we are in possession of our inheritance, and know that the title-deeds are secure, should we waste our energy, or perplex those who are co-heirs in our possession, by sifting those deeds, or removing cavils, which we know to be ungrounded? The supposed magnitude of rationalist erudition is moreover either unfounded in fact, or bears not upon the point for which it is

* Saturday Evening, p. 123, sqq.

alleged. The learning of the genuine Rationalist, as far as it relates to these points, is laughed to scorn by the real philologians of Germany, as the emptiness of their religious theories is by its genuine philosophers. The Rationalists have learning in subjects to which they have really applied themselves, the illustration of manners and customs, or the investigation of antiquities, whatever in fact relates to the mere exterior in which Scriptural truth is conveyed. This required no great earnestness of mind: for this, ordinary diligence might suffice; but in the points in which we are really concerned, they have been as other men; nay, the very employment on these lesser matters, and the pains which they have bestowed on these detached questions, have rendered them the less qualified to judge on those which lie at the core. As Claudius* says of the commentators on the Evangelist St. John, in his day, "They have busied themselves with the evening cloud which veils the full bright moon, but the moon, as she walks behind it in her beauty, they have left in peace." It is in truth a mere sophism, which has transferred the credit of rationalist diligence from those subjects which were the objects of their study to those which were not. But though the inference is false, the impression made is not the less powerful; rationalist learning on other points, has been

* Werke, tom. 1. p. 9.

set in advantageous contrast with the want of information apparent in many of our Clergy: the unfavourable impression of our weakness ought then to be removed by the increase of our strength. An imaginary disease may kill as effectually as a real one. When also it is in the power of any one, at a cheap rate of learning, to become the aggressor, those also who understand the defence ought not to be few.

There is, lastly, much ground to hope that greater theological knowledge would promote greater union in our Church. Few will have failed to observe, how much enlarged knowledge has tended to destroy the narrowness of party: those who have learnt to know how Christian truth has been expressed in olden times and by former men, will recognise it with joy, wherever they discover it; to those, who have been accustomed to look for it only in a limited range of favourite divines, it will be unfamiliar in any other language, and therefore distasteful. A more catholic study of Christian doctrine must needs further a more catholic spirit. An acquaintance also with the works of the primitive Christians, would tend to diminish the wilfulness of spirit and impatience of authority, which now often harasses our Church; a knowledge of their language would terminate many of the differences which now sorely hinder the cordial co-operation of her two great parties, and the active influence of the whole. Nor need

it be more than hinted, that had a sounder scriptural interpretation, and a deeper study of God's dealings, existed amongst us, we might have been spared those perplexities with regard to tongues and to miracles, which have, of late, disquieted some even of the Clergy, and given much occasion of offence.

II. Having dwelt thus at length on the necessity of clerical education, I am willing to speak the more briefly on the mode of providing for it, because I am convinced that any evil will be removed as soon as it shall be fully and adequately felt. Yet, having resided for some time at foreign Universities, and observed both the advantages and defects in their system of clerical education, I may be, perhaps, permitted to state in what these appeared to me to consist, without thereby implying any undue anxiety, that precisely that system should be adopted which to me may appear the best. This I would willingly leave to those, whose office, as well as their experience and practical wisdom, renders them the proper judges in this matter.

The disadvantages, then, of the German* system appear to me to lie in its application, rather than in the system itself. Its evils are of exactly

* I speak of the *German* system especially, as having myself witnessed it, but that of the rest of Protestant Europe, and of the United States, is, in the main, the same.

the contrary character to those incidental to our own. They result from the want of a sufficient preparatory education before the study of theology is commenced, and the consequent unripeness of the theological student, in age, in thought, and in discipline of mind, for the studies upon which he is to enter. Its advantages, on the other hand, result from the excellent division of labour, which at once ensures an adequate number of instructors, and guarantees to those instructors the liberty of employing the peculiar talents, which God has given them, upon that subject for which those talents are best calculated. The union of the English and German systems would appear to me to be calculated to form one, perhaps the most perfect which could well be devised: as it is, the Germans have sacrificed the preparatory branch of University education, we, the professional: they have a complete scheme of theological instruction for students unprepared to receive it: we have an admirable preparatory education, but no suitable system engrafted upon it.

The preparatory studies in Germany, namely, at the present time (for it was otherwise some fifty years past), are supposed to be concluded at the school. On the removal of the student to the University, he passes at once from boyhood to manhood: at once, instead of discipline and control, he is left almost unfettered, even by moral guidance: the only requisition made is that he

should attend some one or more sets of lectures; some general advice is also given as to the method which it may be most advantageous for him to pursue: but, beyond this, what instruction he should receive, or from whom, whether he should live as a Christian, or as a Heathen, (provided he interrupt not the public peace,) is left to his own option.*

The students have, moreover, an indefinite power of quitting any University whenever they please; and it rarely happens that any individual begins and concludes his residence at the same place: he is admitted to any new University with the same advantages which he would have had by remaining at the last. A considerable portion of the students in the principal Universities are, in consequence, not members of the state in which the University is situated, and consequently scarcely under the control even of the civil government. In the seven Prussian Univer-

* Insulated attempts to *influence* the students by means of personal intercourse, were indeed made by some very Christian Professors with whom it was my happiness to be acquainted in Germany; and this, I am assured, was, to individuals, of very great and lasting benefit: but I am now speaking of the *general* system; such only as were already in some measure well-disposed, would, for the most part, be drawn within the circle of the Professor's influence. This absence of control was generally advocated by the Professors themselves, as allowing the character to form itself unfettered.

sities the proportion of foreigners was, in 1830, very nearly one-fifth;* in the Hanoverian University, Göttingen, it was, in 1825, a decided majority of the whole. In that year, the Government having decided on the expulsion of some members, in consequence of the very great number of duels then fought, it became a question among those students, who were not Hanoverians, whether they should not as a body leave the University, if this act of discipline, slight as it was in proportion to the offence, should be enforced. And this decision, which was to be determined by certain heads of the different clans, would have been so imperative, that not one foreigner would have remained at the University. It was understood at the time, that many of the University authorities were, in consequence, averse to the enforcement of the measure, however necessary; not, one should hope, on account of the diminution of income which would ensue (much of that income being derived from the payments of the students), but on account of the loss of distinction resulting

* The numbers, as given in an interesting table in the British Magazine (No. VI., p. 624-5), were 4984 Prussians, 1153 foreigners. The proportion varies, however, in different Universities; in Halle (which was a few years ago one of the worst specimens of German students), the foreigners were above one-fourth of the whole, but the proportion is the same at Berlin, where the students, being of less importance, are better conducted.

to their University, through the great decrease of their numbers. It may be imagined what degree of discipline is in consequence enforced.*

It is in the midst of the feelings of such newly acquired independence, and of all the tumult of mind arising from the first uncontrolled use of his mental powers, in the midst of self-gratulation and self-confidence, that the theological student is left, or invited, at once to enter upon studies, which, beyond all others, demand patience, self-control, earnestness, submission, soberness. The evil is, doubtless, aggravated by the present state of the German Universities, in most of which the student has his choice whether he shall derive his instruction from a Rationalist, or at least from one approaching to Rationalism, or from a Believer. And this aggravated form of the evil we may hope to see diminished, as it has already been in the Prussian Universities, by the careful appointment to the vacant Professorships. But even were this extreme evil altogether removed, and theology everywhere taught, as, or more nearly, as it ought

* About two years ago, a Professor at Halle was supposed by the students to have been the author of a strong but deserved censure upon two favourite, though Rationalist Professors, which appeared in a religious Periodical: the Professor was insulted in the streets, obliged to be escorted by some military to the lecture-room, and the students were pacified, in the first instance, by a compromising speech on the part of the authorities.

to be, it would still be very hurtful that the students should enter upon these holy studies, when in a frame of mind, naturally the least calculated to appreciate or to receive them. However carefully, moreover, the gradation of the different theological sciences may be observed, and the least difficult proposed at the outset, still this is no real remedy, where the whole method of treating these subjects is ill adapted for the age of those to whom they are imparted. The questions in every branch of theology, discussed in Germany, are strong meat for persons who require a less oppressive nourishment. Questions, as they would occur to the ripened divine, are propounded to those who scarcely know the first elements of theology. The momentous subjects of inspiration or revelation, the Canon of Scripture, the relation of the Old Testament to the New, are presented with all the array of embarrassments with which human perverseness has invested them, to persons utterly incapable of forming a right judgment upon them, and more likely to pervert than to digest the instruction which the Professor communicates. At the best, all which could be anticipated from the ordinary student, is a subsequent and tardy digestion of subjects which, at the time, he cannot comprehend. The students, meanwhile, expect that the Professor should declare to them his opinion upon each subject which has been agitated among

the German Theologians: by reserve upon any point, (it matters not whether it be fitted for their age or no,) he forfeits their confidence and his own reputation.

The mode again, in which the information is given, namely continuous oral delivery, although it may be well calculated for persons who have obtained definite ideas upon any subject, is little suited for those to whom that subject is altogether new. It produces imitators, not genuine divines; it imparts knowledge, but it does not instruct or form the mind. No subsequent digestion of any subject can compensate for the loss of that activity of mind, and that perception of one's own real difficulties, which is produced by independent study, preparatory to the imparting of instruction. The whole of education, nay the whole of our entire education through our whole lives, is a gradual correction of the erroneous conceptions which we had at first mingled with the truth; and the forcing system, which would anticipate this slow developement, may produce an earlier show, but undoubtedly will not foster plants so healthy or so hardy. *This* evil effect of the system, as it at present acts, has been seen and acknowledged by the German Professors, and they have endeavoured to avert it, by frequently and earnestly warning their students against such an accumulation of lectures, as allows no time for subsequent reflection: some also of their most

eminent writers* have bitterly lamented the character of slavish imitation, which this system has contributed to stamp upon a large portion of their nation. There is probably no people, among whom the mighty dead are so soon forgotten, or the great names of the present day so unduly exalted, as in Germany; none, probably, among whom the crude or faulty notions of individuals obtain for a time so extensive and pernicious a sway; and this, because the knowledge of the mass of each generation is derived, for the most part, *exclusively*, from living sources.

Yet, although these evils shew the great and especial difficulty of rightly communicating theological knowledge—great in proportion to its importance and its eminence,—they arise too palpably from the peculiar character of the German system, to be any ground of discouragement. It may, indeed, remain a question how far the catechetical system of instruction, which at present prevails at our Universities, and which is in some degree, although insufficiently, adopted by the German, should be in any degree exchanged for continuous delivery on the part of the Professors.

For myself, I should think, that there are few subjects in which the catechetical system is not the best calculated to call forth the energies of the mind, or promote its healthful indepen-

* e. g. Lessing and Herder.

dence.* More good can be effected by correcting or enlarging the ideas, which the student may have himself framed, and thus leading him onward to further truths, or a deeper insight into things, than by any mass of information which may be imparted, or by any knowledge of the systems of other men. What he thus acquires becomes his own. Equal information may also, at some slight expense of time, be imparted; and a due respect and love for the treasures of old time, which God has preserved to us, be most readily combined with the correction or the completion of what, as men, they may have left imperfect.

Being thus alive to the evils of the German system, I shall, I trust, be esteemed no partial admirer of it, if I advert to its advantages. These, as was above mentioned, appeared to me to consist in the division of labour among the Professors; and this is of no slight moment, whether we regard its effect on the Professors themselves, or upon theological literature generally, or with reference to the immediate question of theological education.

1. The advantage, then, of the German system, if proposed to students adequately prepared to

* I am glad to be able to support these opinions, which are the result of long observation of the systems in this country and in Germany, by the valuable authority of Dr. Chalmers, (on Endowments, Note G. p. 185.)

receive it, consists, as far as they are concerned, in its *completeness.* There is, indeed, no portion of theological knowledge requisite or desirable for the discharge of the pastoral office, or for the more scientific portion of the clerical duties, for the study of which provision is not made. In the nature of these studies, there is, as indeed there ought to be, but little peculiar: there may be some greater minuteness of subdivision than may be desirable, as it is the natural tendency of every system to glide into its kindred defect: but, in the main, the studies there pursued are such as would be every where acknowledged to be valuable and necessary for the well-instructed Christian minister. To these pursuits, in their broad outline, no one would object that they contained any thing superfluous. They are, namely, continued instruction in the whole of the New Testament (except the Revelations,) and the principal portions of the Old, in their original languages—the history of early Christianity, and of that smaller portion of God's Church, of which they are members, and whose ministers they are to be (the two branches of Church history, which are to every one of especial moment)—a connected view of the doctrines and practical duties of Christianity—and, lastly, the mode of applying and concentrating all the knowledge hitherto acquired, upon what is now to be the great object of their lives, the bringing Christianity home to the hearts

and minds of their people. The same system, in its main features, is in fact, adopted in the American Episcopalian Church.* The peculiarity is, that these subjects are *taught*, and that fully and systematically, whereas in England, if learnt at all, they must be obtained with difficulty from a variety of sources, not very accessible to one of moderate means. Nor can, after all, the study of books ever replace altogether the assistance of a living teacher.

In the commencement of all studies, scarcely any thing is of more importance than that the student should confine himself for his own reading to a well selected but small number of books:† a larger mass only perplexes him, and prevents definite study and the acquisition of clear views. Yet no one book can fully exhaust his subject; it requires to be supplied, corrected, followed up, or illustrated by knowledge derived from other sources. This

* An account of this system, derived from Bishop Hobart, is given by Mr. Raikes, in his "Remarks on Clerical Education," p. 24, 5. His account of the present state of clerical education is fair and striking; although he appears somewhat to have overrated what is done at the two Dissenting Seminaries, in comparison with the advantages *offered* at the Universities. The Dissenters, however, can compel attendance, which we cannot.

† "Let me earnestly caution the student against diffusing his reading over too wide a surface; to read a few good authors thoroughly, is better than to read many hastily and cursorily." *Bishop Kaye's Charge.*

then is the task of the Professor, who may be supposed to have studied his subject in all its bearings; to have passed the knowledge of other men and other books, through the alembic of his own mind, and to present it to his pupils in a condensed form, stripped of the foreign materials which may have adhered to it. Nor is there any danger that the Professor's lectures should ever become a mere spoken book; for although the substance of them, if ever printed, must assume one definite form, they would, while orally delivered, vary according to the character or the exigencies of his hearers. And in this vividness and power of application, the great advantage of the living teacher consists: a book is to us whatever we make of it: we perceive more or less of its meaning, enter more or less into its spirit, realize it more or less to ourselves according to our habits of study or of mind; and any one who remembers his own crude ideas in early life, will recollect how little comparatively he did appropriate to himself of any really valuable work, how much remained to him yet unintelligible or unappreciated. Living instruction, on the contrary, adapted itself to us; it was as a book written precisely for our use, our knowledge, and our powers. Let any one, (to take one portion only of the instruction of the German Universities,) let any one recollect the time when he sat down to his pastoral duties, even with the advantage of having the best books on those duties

recommended to him, and compare his situation with what it would have been, had he been previously trained in those duties by an experienced parochial Minister; had he gone through with him their several offices, and had the doubts or difficulties, which must occur to any one in the perusal of any set of rules, been removed by the practical knowledge of his adviser. Again, it is undoubtedly expedient for any person, at the commencement of his systematic and more advanced study of the Bible, to read it alone in the original; one commentator would give a partial view, and a number would perplex him; yet of what inestimable advantage would it be to any one, in such case, to compare his immature or undecided views with those of one, who had for years patiently and humbly investigated those Scriptures, with all the aids, human and divine, which are open to man. If this be done, even to a small extent, principles of interpretation may be imparted, which may be of service in the whole of the sacred volume: tendencies of mind, which might lead to false or vague or inadequate apprehensions of divine truth, might be corrected; the best mode of studying Holy Scripture might be practically illustrated, and the student, being thus not merely furnished as before with a chart, but having his hand steadied, and his eye quickened, and his judgment formed, might be left to guide his own future course with confidence and joy.

Nor, again, should I account it a slight advantage in oral instruction, that the Professor is in this way enabled practically to open to his pupils the *fontes remoti*, and by a judicious selection of such portions as may interest them, to lead them on themselves to taste their freshness and their richness. The mere recommendation of the commentaries of Chrysostom or Theodoret, of Calvin or Beza, would perhaps be rather calculated to alarm than to invite the theological student: the production, on the contrary, of passages, in which these mighty men have happily developed the meaning of Holy Writ, or furnished in their own emphatic language exactly the sense which the case requires, animates one to deeper study, cherishes the respect for the wisdom of former ages, and above all, tends to produce the longing for a larger portion of that Spirit with which those giants of old time were so deeply imbued.

Another advantage of this public over private study, is that a public, and in some measure compulsory, course of instruction alone can be complete. Even in our duties we consult our ease. It is only experimentally that we can know the real value of most of the knowledge which we acquire. If there be some portions of divine knowledge so obviously necessary that we could not dare to pass them over, there will be none, probably, in which we should not have omitted, as needless or perhaps as distracting us from our main object,

what we have afterwards found of very essential service. At our first outset, we are disposed to take nothing with us but what we *then* think of direct practical use; other things we are disposed to lay aside either as positive incumbrances in our course, or as interfering with acquisitions which we deem to be of more moment. We pursue what we think most useful, probably as being most congenial to our own tastes, whereas what we are disposed to omit, as being less accordant with those tastes, is, on that very account, the more important to *us*, and to the right compass of our minds. It is indeed well, even within the province of Theology, that persons should, in matured life, choose some portion, for which their own talents may be the best calculated, and by the cultivation of which they may most benefit themselves and the Church. But, in earlier years, no part should be omitted:* in each portion, the student should be

* The advantage, and indeed necessity, of some such compulsion, is illustrated by the following statement, furnished me by Dr. Burton, of the number who attended, in the last year, his private lectures in the Acts and Epistles. They were in Lent Term, 27, in Easter, 32, in Michaelmas, 36, in all 95; but of those who attended in Easter Term, 9 only had attended in Lent, and 10 only continued in Michaelmas; so that there were in all 74 individuals, of whom 57 attended for one, 19 for two terms. The one term's residence is what is required of every member of the University who takes the degree of M. A.; and thus it appears, that the attendance of 57 out of 74 was owing to their being *compelled* to reside at the University for one term; this term they

conducted so far, as practically to know the nature of the study, and the best method of pursuing it. *Ex nihilo nil fit*, is true in most cases of study: we have no means of ascertaining, or even of appreciating the value of what we are wholly unacquainted with; we have no standard by which to estimate it; and public opinion, to which men generally refer, being the opinion of persons who are equally unacquainted with the subject, will uniformly fix too low the measure of attainment.

A long interval has elapsed, during which it has not been considered at all essential for a Clergyman to understand the Scriptures of the Old Testament in their original language: the value of Hebrew for the right interpretation of the New, is

were willing to employ profitably; but when this compulsion ceased, the knowledge of their profession was no longer a sufficient ground to detain them for its study. Six more attended during the fortnight in which they were *obliged* to attend the public lectures. Those who attended the lectures in Ecclesiastical History, in which there is, under present circumstances, less ground to expect an examination, averaged 10 only. Again, in the present term, of 21, who are attending a very interesting course of lectures in the Fathers, 17 are members of some Collegiate foundation: the whole of the rest of the University furnishes *four* only. Increased facilities of theological instruction would increase very considerably the number who would avail themselves of the provision already furnished; while it would entitle our Bishops to insist on higher qualifications in the candidates for orders. At present our ranks are filled by volunteers only; and these, although often zealous, yet will never equal the numbers of a corps regularly disciplined.

even now scarcely felt: it has not again, until lately, been thought necessary that a Christian minister should know the history of the Church of Christ; what Christianity has effected at all times, or how men, alike by adding to it or by taking from it, have diminished its blessed influence: why it sunk and how it again rose: how errors or speculations, apparently of little moment, have been the source of great and lasting evil: or how divisions, in themselves slight, have at last rent the seamless vestment of Christ. Generation after generation have been content to be ignorant of every portion of Church History, and to forfeit the benefit of all the instruction which God has put into their hands, by his dealings with the Church for 1800 years; or even of that which has most direct relation to their own usefulness, and without which they can scarcely avoid material error, the knowledge of their own portion of the Universal Church.

I gladly acknowledge that advances, or rather that a return to a better state of things has been made during these latter years; not so much through the institutions of St. David's and St. Bees, (for these, though useful and necessary, are but expedients) as through the improved theological spirit of the Universities:* but this is itself the

* "I have sincere pleasure in bearing the testimony of my own experience to the fact, that the standard of ministerial acquirements has already been greatly raised, without diminution in the

result of education, and is an earnest, that with more cultivation, a more abundant and richer harvest will result.

Amidst all the disadvantages of their system, the Germans have attained the object which they now mainly propose, the promotion of extensive learning: ample* provision being made for theological instruction, it is in the power of the German consistories, by means of their examination, to compel the student to avail himself of it; and thus, although the German student is left unhappily far too much to his own guidance, his diligence in study for a great portion of his residence is secured by the prospect of the final examination. The proportion of the students in each University, who diligently employ themselves, is larger, I have reason to think, than in any other country. The Clergy of that country are, accordingly, as a body, a learned Clergy: that their learning has often failed of producing fruits of corresponding value is but another evidence of the insufficiency of mere knowledge, but furnishes no proof that when grafted into a better stock, it will not yield an abundant return.

number of applicants for admission into the Ministry, and with the most obvious and striking benefit to the Church itself."—*Bp. of London's Charge.*

* Some specimens of the subjects of lectures in German Universities will be given in the Appendix A. I have myself witnessed very frequently the diligence and attention of the hearers.

2. The second advantage of division of labour, that resulting to the Professors themselves, is too manifest to detain us long. I know not whether any situation could be devised for the cultivation of any branch of knowledge, and especially of any practical knowledge, more advantageous than that of a Professor. The necessity of studying for others, of examining his subject in every bearing, of removing every difficulty, of proposing every thing clearly, ensures the great requisites in all study, precision, comprehensiveness, clearness, and, above all, a practical view in its pursuit, and a practical tendency in its result. When we study for ourselves, we may rest satisfied with obtaining partial results, and we may often, without any great detriment to our immediate object, pass over much slightly, reserve incidental difficulties for subsequent examination, content ourselves with what lies upon or near the surface, or repose upon the green or brighter spots, or where we have ourselves found most refreshment and delight. In our public duties we have a more apparent responsibility. We dare neglect nothing, gloss over nothing; there is no time to influence or instruct those, whose care we have taken upon ourselves, but the present: we must impart definite and distinct views, or we fail altogether: we must give our own studies a practical tendency, or we can never be the means of communicating a practical spirit to our pupils. Collision moreover im-

proves us: a doubt, a difficulty, even a theory which has nothing substantial in it, will give occasion to maturer thought or intenser study: it causes the teacher to re-examine his own positions, to see if there be any flaw in them, any point as yet insufficiently surveyed or secured. In the words of an original and imaginative writer,* and who is on that account the more obviously to be listened to, when he speaks of the value of patient and enduring perseverance;

"We cannot imagine a more favourable condition for the formation of a great literary work, that shall have solid and enduring excellence, than that which is occupied by an ardent and devoted Professor, whose course, by means of reiterated elaborations, receives a slow, it may be, but withal a sure and progressive improvement. Only conceive him to be fully possessed with his subject, and giving the full strength of his mind to its elucidation; and then, with the advantages of perseverance, and time, and frequent periodical reiteration of the topics of his lectureship, he is assuredly in the best possible circumstances for bequeathing to posterity some lasting memorial of industry or genius. It is by the remodellings and revisings, every year, of his yet imperfect preparations; it is by strengthening what is weak, and further illustrating what is obscure, and fortifying some position or principle by a new argument,

* Chalmers on Endowments, pp. 50, 51.

and aiding the conception of his disciples by some new image, or new analogy; it is thus that the product of his official labours may annually acquire increasing excellence, and gradually approximate to a state of faultlessness, till at length it comes forth in a work of finished execution, and becomes a permanent addition to the classical and literary wealth of the nation. It is not so often by flashes of inspiration, as by power and patience united, that works are reared and ripened for immortality. It is not in the hasty effervescence of a mind under sudden and sanguine excitement, that a service so precious to society is generally rendered. It is when a strong, and, at the same time, a steadfast mind gives its collected energies to the task; and not only brings its own independent judgment, but laboriously collecting the lights of past erudition, brings them also to bear on the subject of its investigation."

Yet, in order to secure these advantages, it is manifestly essential that the teacher should have a distinct and a definite line of duties: for in proportion as it is beneficial to a sound and thorough study of any subject thus to propose it successively to minds of different stamps and measures, and for that purpose to bestow upon it renewed and painful attention, so can nothing be more distracting than to have to teach a variety of subjects, not immediately connected with or directly illustrating one another. Although a Divine dare

neglect no portion of theological study, yet it is manifest that very different talents, and very different study, are necessary to enable any one to *excel*, in the interpretation of Scripture, in tracing the connexion of causes and effects in the history of the Church, and deriving its practical lessons —in the systematic exhibition and defence of the doctrines or evidences of Christianity—or in furnishing and illustrating the rules for the practical duties of the Christian minister. Bishop Bull would not probably have succeeded in the office of Bishop Butler, nor either in the duties of Pococke, but each and all these great men had their several duties, and each stood foremost in his own. The absence of this division of labour is the real evil which now presses so heavily upon our tutors, and our Divinity Professors. Each is required to furnish instruction in a greater variety of subjects than any man's mind can possibly master; their energy must either be divided by attention to too great a multiplicity of subjects, or they must neglect some portion of instruction, which, as things now are, can be supplied by no other means.

3. The difference of the two systems becomes the more apparent when we refer to the theological literature of the two countries. Almost the whole of German divinity is the result of professorial duties: there can scarcely be produced

the name of any writer of eminence in that country, to whom the leisure, the occasion, and the foundation of his works, was not supplied by these employments : their occupations lead as directly to the composition of theological works, as the practical employments of the majority of our Clergy divert them from it : they have distinct *studies*, which it is the business of their lives to pursue ; the duties of our Clergy, with very few exceptions, are altogether practical : every portion of their country has it's Universities ; they have twenty-three of these seminaries of theological, as well as every other sort of, learning, with the array of teachers of divinity in each : we have but two, very slenderly provided with theological, or indeed, with any other Professors. On the ordinary scale in which provision is made by German sovereigns for theological instruction, there must be, at the least 125 divines in Germany, with matured strength and powers, filling the office of Professors ; besides these, they have the whole train of extraordinary Professors, licentiates, and private instructors, who are filling subordinate offices of the same kind, and preparing themselves for the higher theological duties, which they are hereafter to discharge. And this includes not the whole of the provision made for the study of Hebrew. Our whole number, including the Hebrew Professors at either University, is seven, and of these seven, one at Cambridge, a recent institution, derived from the

liberality of an individual, must unhappily be materially impaired in its efficiency by the conditions annexed to it. We have been reproached with inactivity; we have been told that*—

"It is high time for the well-paid champions of orthodoxy in this country, to awake from the dignified slumbers, in which it is their delight to indulge, and to take some notice of those incursions into their sacred territory, which the theologians of Germany have so long been permitted to make without any repulse. We are assured by Shakspeare, that 'dainty bits make rich the ribs, but bankerout the wits;' nor could we ask a much more pregnant proof of this fact, than the striking contrast which exists between the poor, active, studious, and inquisitive theologians of Germany, and the sleek, somnolent, and satisfied divines of the Church of England. The priests of Egypt, we are told, abstained from drinking the water of the Nile, because they found it fattening; the Pactolus of the Church also fattens, but it is not abstained from; and the consequence is, that our portly sentinels slumber on their posts, while the lean† theolo-

* Edinburgh Review, No. 107. "State of Protestantism in Germany."

† The *leanness* of the incomes of these divines may be well questioned: the average of the Professors' salaries at Göttingen is 200*l.* per annum, to which the fees arising from his lectures, (supposing that he gives in each half year two courses, and is attended by 100 pupils,) would add, at the least, 300*l.*, a sum much more than equivalent to twice the amount in England. Neither is the theology of the majority of these theologians so lean as this Reviewer deems; there are, in either University, very eminent theologians, who have come to no other conclusions than the somnolent divines of the English Church.

gians of Halle and Göttingen carry away all the glory of the field."

Yet, (since almost all the members of our cathedrals, have *now* also parochial cures) until our critics can propound to us by what means 6 or 7 Professors can be as productive of literary works as 125, or how it is as advantageous to be distracted with a variety of theological pursuits, as to be concentrated upon those of one kind; or how, lastly, the duties of a parochial Clergyman leave equal leisure with those of a German Professor, the taunt might have well been spared. But let the author of that Review compare things of the same kind; let him take one Divinity chair in any one University of Germany, and compare those who have occupied it successively, with our line of Divinity Professors at Oxford to the present time; or let him go through the whole number of those who have in Germany employed their labours on the original Scriptures of the Old Testament, and compare them with those who have filled our one Hebrew chair at Oxford; or let him find any one man who has there done as much for the illustration of the Old Testament as our Pococke, (who may, much more than Schultens of Holland, be called the parent of our more enlarged studies of the sacred language;) or let him discover one of more laborious diligence than Castell, Professor at Cambridge, who, during seventeen years, accounted that day a holiday

in which he did not employ from sixteen to eighteen hours upon his gigantic works, and he may then appear not to have spoken rashly. Or if he prefer modern times and men, let him name any German Professor who had a more thorough and native knowledge of Arabic than Dr. Nicoll, our late Hebrew Professor, or any sounder or more accurate Orientalist than Professor Lee; or let him find among his Neological Professors, (to take only our present Regius Professor of Divinity,) a more fertile, as assuredly he will not find so solid, a writer as Dr. Burton. Only let the works be weighed, not numbered; nor let such productions, as the works of the Rosenmüllers, (every syllable in whose writings, which is of any value, may be traced to older, and some to English sources,) be thrown into the balance against our original English theology; nor let activity be supposed only to exist in the discovery of ephemeral novelties.

But I turn with pleasure from this writer, who has apparently little knowledge of the Germans whom he praises, and still less of the English whom he condemns, to the healthful and vigorous language of his countryman, Dr. Chalmers.* After speaking of the merits of the Dissenters in the pro-

* On Endowments, pp. 60, 1. Dr. Chalmers' work ought to be read by every one, who is obliged to approach the question of Endowments. Two passages of a similar tendency and energy are quoted from the same writer by Lord Henley.—*Plan*, pp. 27, 8.

duction of works of practical piety, he adds, "It is not to be disguised, that, with all their powerful appeals to conscience, there is not among them that full and firm staple of erudition which is to be found among the Divines of the Establishment, to whom, after all, the theological literature of our land is chiefly beholden. To them we are, in the main, indebted for a species of literature, which in no country of Europe is carried to such a height as among ourselves. We allude to the part which they have sustained in the deistical controversy, and to the masterly treatises wherein they have so thoroughly scrutinized and set forth the Christian argument. But it is not in the war with infidelity alone that they have signalized themselves. A bare recital of the names associated with Oxford and Cambridge, would further convince us, that, from these mighty strongholds have issued our most redoubted champions of orthodoxy; and that the Church of which they are the feeders and the fountain heads, has, of all others, stood the foremost, and wielded the mightiest polemic arm in the battles of the faith."

It is needless to add anything to this testimony: it is the testimony of one, who is not a member of the Church, whose institutions, and their results, he admires; of one, who has no partiality to mislead him, but who does admire and love them, for the service which they have rendered to our common Christianity.

It was indeed to the leisure afforded by these endowments that we owe, under God, our English Theology; a Theology richer and more solid than that of any other Church. Through them and our Collegiate Institutions we have been spared, by God's mercy, one great evil, resulting from the paucity of the provision made for the instruction of the Clergy. By their means, has been removed the anomaly of expecting a learned Clergy, without providing for their education. Deep, however, as ought to be our gratitude for the treasures thus bestowed upon us, it may still be useful to advert to some peculiarities in that literature, and some deficiencies which have resulted from the mode in which it was created. The fundamental peculiarity of our English Theology is, that it was occasional; that it took its rise in some specific exigencies of the Church: and it is a glorious distinction, that our immortal works were written, not for any display of their authors, but for the well-being of the Church; that one can hardly name any one great work, for whose production some ground in the circumstances and the wants of the Church cannot be assigned. It is well that it should be so: for this practical and catholic spirit, in that it subdues the feeling of self, and exalts that of a great and solemn responsibility to our fellow Christians and to God, affords the best guarantee, that the works so conceived shall serve no temporary interest, or perishable ends, shall not be defiled by human

passions or prejudices, but having God, and God's glory for their end and aim, shall have also for their aim that truth which is to be found in God only. The works originating in this spirit, though suggested by some special occasion, yet are written for all times, and are a blessing for all ages, because the spirit which dictated them, and the principles which they impart, will endure for ever. Still it could scarcely be expected that the whole field of theology should be occupied by these independent and unconnected efforts: the positions which were taken up, were on every side fenced and guarded, and little could be added to strengthen the lines, drawn by Butler or by Hooker. Yet though each work was in itself as complete as human infirmity would permit, our English theology, as a whole, must needs be unsystematic, since system was never aimed at; and it must also be deficient in works for the young theologian, since they were the wants of the Church at large, not those of the beginner, which called forth the efforts which were made. Thus points of Ecclesiastical History, or the rites of the Universal Church, have been illustrated by Pearson and Beveridge, by Usher, Bingham, and Wall, with a learning and accuracy which could not well be surpassed: for, to a Church built like our own, on the foundations of the apostles and prophets, the knowledge of Christian antiquity was of especial and primary importance: but there seemed

no especial occasion for an Ecclesiastical History, as a whole, beyond what was already furnished by foreign divines; or, which is more probable, those who did really study it, being in the neighbourhood of large libraries, and with the possession of ample leisure, sought each for himself the original sources. The result has been, that we have as yet no general Ecclesiastical History which can satisfy the wants of the student; and the miserable translation of Mosheim, with which we have until lately contented ourselves, has served only to deter men from the whole study. We have again admirable treatises on the main doctrines of Christianity, but scarcely any connected view of those doctrines in their mutual bearings on each other; or we have, further, scattered up and down in other theological works, admirable expositions of detached portions of Holy Scripture, and excellent illustrations of Christian duty, but we have no good systematic treatise on Christian Ethics, and what is of more moment, we have no Commentary upon large portions of Holy Scripture to which to refer the student. The very difficulties which have thus been presented to early theological study, may perhaps have been even beneficial to those who have been led to surmount them; the hardening process through which they had to pass, made them vessels of greater value: difficulty strengthens the energy which it does not break: the very absence of works calculated for their

early strength drove them to deeper researches, and to explore richer mines; and God having given them the strength to penetrate these recesses, converted what in man's sight were hindrances, into the very means and instrument of their progress: still such men are a small portion only; however valuable their labours are for succeeding ages, they do not stamp the character of the present; however wide and salutary their influence, they cannot supply to their contemporaries the benefits of a Clergy, generally well instructed. Suns they may have been, but they cannot replace the warmth of the domestic hearth.

Here then is a wide field open for future exertion. Notwithstanding all that has been done, we still want, for every portion of the Bible, commentaries, which, with practical piety may unite sound philological learning, and deep insight into the connexion and spirit of each of the sacred writers. Even within these narrower limits very peculiar talents are required in each divine; for not only would not the same person be likely equally to succeed in commenting upon the Old and New Testament, but the best commentator on the Proverbs and Job would not be the most successful expositor of the Prophets; the developement of the connexion and full meaning of the Gospel of St. John will require different talents and character of mind from the Epistles of St. Paul. I

need not enter into the like details with regard to Ecclesiastical History, (whether that of the Church before Christ, which it is of especial moment that our young divines should in these days rightly understand, or that of the Christian Church, an ignorance of which is now leading men into great practical errors) nor again, as to doctrinal theology, Christian ethics, or pastoral theology. In all we require books for these times, and these circumstances. In none could we safely content ourselves, if we would wish, with works of foreign divines, however excellent in themselves. Every nation, as it has its own peculiar character, and its own constitution of mind, so will it have its own peculiar wants: and although the essential truth must be every where the same, still the form in which it is presented must be adapted to that character and those wants. The more peculiar then the mode may be, in which the character of any people has developed itself, the less will its theology, generally, if suited to that nation, be calculated to be transferred directly to any other. The works of the better German theologians may, I trust, render us, indirectly, very important service, by giving a stimulus to a similar spirit among ourselves; but they are for the most part, too much adapted to the present state of philosophy and religion in that country to be the best fitted for this, much less to supersede any exertions of our own. Nor is there any ground to apprehend

that the office of educating men for the ministry, will not produce this ulterior but important effect, or that the works so produced will be but elementary and confined. To refer to no more modern instance, the valuable Commentaries of Calvin are the produce of his theological lectures.

These three points, then, (each of great moment in itself, and especially in these times)—the sound and general education of our Clergy; the formation of a body of divines, who may, by their *known* attainments, raise the character of the Church, and increase its influence both at home and throughout Protestant Europe;* and the supply of those portions of theological literature which

* This, although an incidental benefit only, yet is not unworthy of consideration to any one who takes a large survey of the condition of the Church of Christ: nor is it unimportant, even in relation to our own Church, if we consider the manifold influences which every portion of the Christian Church must necessarily either impart to others or receive from them, or the direct avenues which a common language will hereafter give to the theology of America. It is already in activity: in default of any means of education in their parent country, to which they would gladly turn, they have already had recourse to Germany, some to the sound, others, unhappily, to the unsound teachers of its theology. If we resume not the eminence, which our excellent preparatory education, and the ever-present example of our ancestors, and the soundness of our institutions, and our ready access to the deep and rich treasures of our old theology, naturally gives us, we shall fail to influence her to good, we may very probably (for in her, good and evil are fearfully balanced,) be influenced by her to evil.

have been hitherto omitted,—these three points may all be attained by the same process.

III. I need scarcely insist on the eminent advantages which the Cathedral establishments possess for this purpose. Besides the conveniences resulting from their being distributed over the several parts of the kingdom, from the libraries which are attached to most of them, and the several facilities of detail which the existence of the canonical houses would give, they have this very great advantage, that they would bring the young candidates for orders at once into the society and under the influence of their future Bishop and Diocesan, and of the elder Clergy. The Bishop, who now has scarcely any opportunity of becoming acquainted with those over whom he is afterwards to preside, and whom, as a father, he is to direct, until within a short time before their ordination, might with no great sacrifice of leisure, establish an intercourse with them, which would win their confidence, would often determine their character, and gain a cheerful and willing obedience to all his subsequent admonitions. The Dean and Prebendaries appear also to be marked out for this duty by the provision of our Church, which prescribes that "the Bishop should be assisted in *examining* and laying on of hands by the Ministers of his Cathedral Church, if they may conve-

niently be had." (Canons 31 and 35.) Nor can it be doubted, that if the same persons, to whom the instruction of candidates for orders should be committed, were thus to assist the Bishop in his examination, the Bishop might obtain a much more satisfactory knowledge of their qualifications; while such as should be in any way incompetent, might be saved the disgrace of an open rejection. I need not say how much influence this religious training might have upon the candidates, or how much more difficult it would be for any man, spiritually unfit for the ministry, to intrude himself among the pastors of the Church of God.

With regard to the details of this measure, if it should seem right to those, who have spiritual authority in the Church, to adopt any such plan, I should be very unwilling to have any appearance of dictating to those who are set over us, and who have naturally much more knowledge and experience in these matters. This I would only say, that Prussia, with a population of about 11,000,000, has seven Universities, and two of these, at least, having a double quota of Professors, (Bonn,* as

* In the table in the Brit. Mag., above quoted, Breslau is stated to have a double Theological Faculty. If this be the case, the sum total must be increased. I include the Roman Catholic Professors, in order to shew the proportion between the entire population, and the number of persons employed in educating its Clergy.

being established in Roman Catholic provinces, and having on that account Roman Catholic Professors also, Halle, as being the union of two establishments,) the Prussian Universities alone would have at least forty-five ordinary Divinity Professors. Berlin,* in 1826, had but four ordinary Professors, (another has since been appointed,) but it had three extraordinary, and two private but authorized lecturers. Hanover, with a population of but 1,400,000, had four ordinary and one extraordinary Professor of Divinity, besides two Professors of the Philosophical Faculty, whose office was to explain the Scriptures grammatically, but who did, in fact, lecture as Theologians.

I would equally wish to avoid fixing any term as the minimum, during which this course of instruction should be followed ; the shortest period in Germany is three years ; perhaps, in consideration of the previous general instruction at the Universities, it might here be limited to two.† Although one would gratefully receive any addition to the theological qualifications of our Clergy, yet less than this, considering the variety of the subjects to be taught, might cause much risk, that

* See further on this subject the tables at the end.

† The Bishop of London, in the interesting charge above quoted, speaks of " a prescribed course of study for one or two years," p. 34. The subject having been mentioned by so high authority, I felt the less scruple in expressing an opinion on this subject.

these subjects would either be unduly crowded together, or that some, which were important, would be omitted.

The change, in order to be effective, ought probably to be slow; it would be hard to compel one, who was about to present himself as a candidate for orders, thus to prepare himself anew, notwithstanding any pains which under the present system he may have taken to educate himself, or any engagements, which, in reliance on the present system, he had formed. The number of persons, who are in each year admitted into Holy Orders, as far as I can make any estimate, may be calculated, I suppose, at about 450;* if these be engaged for two years in their preparation for Orders, those regularly employed at any given time would be 900. This number must of necessity be much increased so soon as effectual measures shall be adopted for providing adequately for the parochial cure of our large towns. But although it would be matter of regret, should any measure be hastily adopted, which would at once divert these institutions to

* The basis of this calculation is, the average number of persons who have attended the public lectures of our Regius Professor of Divinity. This for the last three years has been 220. I have allowed 230 for Cambridge, the number of names on their books being greater. The British Magazine, within the last twelve months, reports the ordinations of 421 Deacons and 377 Priests; and even this list, although the most perfect of those now published, is still hereafter to be rendered "far more complete."

other purposes, and disable them from rendering this great service, yet on the other hand, much care and circumspection will be necessary in adapting a portion of them to these new duties. A plan which would, as far as possible, provide for the education of the Clergy of each diocese, within its own precincts, would seem to be preferable to any other. I would not willingly appear to prescribe as essential any part of my scheme; I would gladly see any plan, which the sound judgment of our Bishops might suggest for clerical education. As in other cases, experience will be the best guide. Much local knowledge will also be requisite, and much consideration, in the selection of the Cathedrals best suited for this purpose. For some Dioceses certainly, as Peterborough or Bristol, may be too small to require a distinct establishment; or the Cathedrals, as in the case of St. Paul's, might from situation, be ineligible as places of education, but be thereby the more calculated, if the cure of important parishes were annexed to them, to render essential benefits to the cities in which they are situated, and for whose benefit they were endowed. Others again, as Chester, may be too poor by themselves to support the persons set apart for this office.

Yet as far as, under these circumstances, any principles may be proposed, two points would seem to be of especial moment. 1. That the number of students collected in each place should not be so

considerable as to prevent personal superintendance on the part of the Professors, or to cause these institutions to degenerate into mere lectureships for imparting theological knowledge. It were, indeed, as easy to communicate a certain quantity of information to 400 persons as to 30; and were this the only or the main object of clerical education, two or four only of these institutions might perhaps have sufficed. Yet the end of education is not the mere acquisition of knowledge, but the training and disciplining the mind, during and by means of that acquisition. Since, then, in a practical Church, such as our own, the formation of the heart and mind will naturally be regarded as of primary importance, it would be desirable to limit the numbers in each institution, in such manner as may best tend to realize these objects. Seventy or eighty theological students would probably be regarded as an adequate number for each institution, and more eligible than a larger body.*

* On this view, a portion (and it should be recollected that it is a portion only) of twelve Cathedrals would be required. And thus, perhaps, York and Carlisle (the latter as united with St. Bees) might be employed for the Northern Counties; Lincoln, Ely, (united with Cambridge), Lichfield, Worcester, Oxford, and if necessary, Glocester, for the Midland; Norwich for the Eastern; Exeter or Wells, Salisbury or Winchester, Canterbury or Rochester, for the Southern counties, and the Diocese of London. Yet this I would say with all deference, in the full conviction that the question if allowed to come before the authorities of the Church, would be by them far more wisely decided.

2. Although, on the grounds above-named, it might not be practicable in every case to make the Cathedral the theological seminary of its own diocese, it would, I imagine, (and rightly) be considered of moment, that the different dioceses should be, in this respect also, as little intermingled as may be ; that whatever Cathedrals may be chosen to discharge the office of clerical education for the rest, each of them at least should provide for the members of its own Diocese, in the hope that the bands, which unite the Clergy with their Bishop, might thereby be the more strengthened.

With regard to the number of Stalls in each Cathedral to be set apart for this purpose, this depends rather upon the nature of the subjects to be taught, than upon the number of those who need instruction. For whether we look to the immediate advantage of those who are to be instructed, or to that of the Church at large, it is of great importance, as has already been urged, that those engaged in this office should not be distracted by a variety of pursuits, but should be able to devote their whole minds to carry on to perfection that for which each has been most fitted by God.

The division already adverted to,* would assign

* Page 50. In the Scotch Universities, where the principle of division of labour is carried further than among ourselves, (in that there is in each a Professor of Ecclesiastical History,) the necessity of a further supply has still been much felt; in the

five Professors to each establishment; and there is no University in Germany so small, in which this division of labour is not preserved. Each province of theology will give ample and distinct occupation; only the instruction in the pastoral office would naturally be best imparted by a parochial minister; an arrangement which would secure to one important parish in each Cathedral town, the services of an experienced minister. This portion of instruction, moreover, might be conducted in such a way, as in itself to render material benefit to these places. For the practical duties, as they are the crown of all theology, so they would be last, in order, of the subjects taught in these institutions. Instruction in them would be the last step in the preparation for Orders. The candidates accordingly would then be of an age, and (in the near prospect of admission into their holy profession) it is to be hoped would be earnest enough, to render good service in the several branches of practical duties, with which, at the discretion of the minister, they would be entrusted. General principles must indeed be given, and the result of the experience of an active Clergyman must at all times be invaluable to a beginner; yet in practical duties, it is by practice that we best learn, and it will be by the gradual initiation into these duties

absence of any provision for this purpose, the exposition of the New Testament forms no part of the instruction of Candidates for the Christian Ministry.

under the eye of an experienced pastor, that the student will in these respects most profit. Yet there are, in every large mass of population, duties to be performed, in which the minister may best act as the guiding head ; the execution may safely be left, and must indeed be completed by others. In the management of schools, then, in catechising children,* in visiting the poor, or the sick (under such limitations as the practical knowledge of the minister might prescribe), the Candidates might confer essential benefit on the population, while they were preparing themselves most effectually for the right performance of their future duties. They might relieve the minister of some duties, which he cannot satisfactorily perform, and thereby leave him to wait less distractedly upon those, which he alone would be fitted to discharge.

And no one, who knows any thing of the circumstances of our large towns, how much must be effected by means of institutions and intermediate instruments, and how much more usefully the pastor

* Every Candidate for Orders in Germany is practised in catechising under the eye of the Professor ; and when the children, whom he has catechised, have withdrawn, the defects in his mode of eliciting or communicating knowledge, are fully set before him. To this practical training the great excellence of the system of catechising in Germany, seems to be attributable. The especial usefulness of Halle, in its best days, is ascribed, in great measure, to the advantages which the establishment of the Orphan-House gave to the Candidates for Orders in the practice of their subsequent duties.

will *in many cases* be employed in directing the agencies of others, than in personally performing even necessary duties, will doubt that much real good would directly result from the existence of these institutions. Each of them, while it became the centre of sound theology for its appointed circle, would especially benefit the place most nearly connected with it.

Lastly, although, on many grounds, such a plan (should it be thought adviseable to entertain it,) could not yet be brought into action suddenly or at once, there still appears no reason why it should not be gradually commenced, according to the circumstances of the different Cathedrals. There would, doubtless, be some among the present members, who, though unwilling to take the office upon themselves, would not be prevented by occupation, or other causes, from accepting it, if confided to them by authority. And wherever it should be thought right to form such a nucleus, an adequate number of instructors might easily be obtained, by offering a provision in some other Cathedral to others, who might not have qualified themselves for these duties, or who might prefer such as were purely practical.

The patronage of these offices involves a more difficult and complicated question. On the one hand, it is very desirable to avoid all risk, lest these institutions, which might be rendered serviceable to union within the church, should become

opposed or rival schools of theology. And on this account it were to be wished that the appointments should all be derived from the same source, whatever that source might be. On the other hand, although ecclesiastical patronage, rightly considered, is a burthen to those entrusted with the responsibility of making choice of fit persons, still it were not right to deprive any one even of a burthensome trust, since if rightly employed it brings with it its appropriate reward. Yet possibly some arrangement or exchange might be made, by which, without diminishing the power of the Bishops to reward their meritorious Clergy, the appointments to these offices might be united in the same hands, and conducted upon the same principles. At all events, it is to be hoped, that if the plan itself appear desirable, any minor difficulties of this sort will not be allowed to interfere with its execution. When this difficulty shall be removed, there seems no other ground, why the appointment should not vest in the Crown, as is the case with the Regius Professorships of Divinity and Hebrew in this place. The great temptation to any Minister to prostitute appointments in the Church to party purposes, exists, where there are few ostensible duties to be done, and there is little upon which public opinion can decide, whether it be in any degree adequately executed. Where there are tangible duties to perform, as in the case of Professorships, Ministers appear generally to have

taken pains to ascertain who were reported to be best qualified for the station. Nor do I doubt, but that their patronage, under this limitation, would be better bestowed than that of a Board, in which the responsibility would be so shared as virtually to be destroyed. If we examine the whole series of appointments to the Regius Professorship of Divinity, whose appointment has been vested in the Crown, it will appear for the most part to have been filled more carefully than the Margaret Professorship, which has been elective.

Nor is the above, even in its whole extent, any new plan; it is, I find, as old as our Reformation itself. "Cranmer had projected," says Bishop Burnet, "that in every Cathedral there should be provision made for Readers of Divinity, and of Greek and Hebrew; and a great number of students to be both exercised in the daily worship of God, and trained up in study and devotion, whom the Bishop might transplant out of this nursery into all parts of his diocese. And thus every Bishop should have had a college of Clergymen under his eye, to be preferred according to their merit. He saw great disorders among some Prebendaries, and, in a long letter, the original of which I have seen, he expressed his regret, that these endowments went in such a channel. Yet now his power was not great at Court, and the other party run down all his motions." "But those," adds the excellent Bishop, "who observed

things narrowly, judged that a good mixture of Prebendaries and young clerks, bred up about Cathedrals, under the Bishop's eye, and the conduct and direction of the Dean and Prebendaries, had been one of the greatest blessings that could have befallen the Church; which not being sufficiently provided of nouses for the forming of the minds and manners of those who are to be received into orders, has since felt the ill effects of it very sensibly. Against this Cranmer had projected a noble remedy, had not the Popish party then at Court, who very well apprehended the advantages such nurseries would have given to the Reformation, borne down this proposition, and turned all the King's bounty and foundations another way."*

Bishop Burnet neglected not to promote, as far as in him lay, the plan he so justly extols. "As the pastoral cure," says his biographer,† "and the admitting none to it, who were not duly qualified, was always uppermost in his thoughts, he concluded that he could not render a more useful

* History of the Reformation, Book III., an. 1540, p. 545-6.

† Life by T. Burnet, Esq. appended to the Hist. of His Own Times. The subject again recurs in Bishop Burnet's "Address to Posterity," (or as he terms it, "his dying Speech or Testament,") in which he proposes a plan "'till our Universities are put in a better method, or till seminaries can be raised, for maintaining a number of persons to be duly prepared for Holy Orders."

service to religion, to the Church, and more especially to his own Diocese, than by forming under his eye a number of Divines, well instructed in all the articles of their duty. He resolved therefore at his own charge, to maintain a small nursery of students in Divinity at Salisbury, who might follow their studies, till he should be able to provide for them. They were ten in number, to each of whom he allowed a salary of thirty pounds a year. They were admitted to him once every day, to give an account of their progress in learning, to propose to him such difficulties as they met with in the course of their reading, and to hear a lecture from him, upon some speculative or practical point of Divinity, or on some part of the pastoral function, which lasted above an hour. During the Bishop's absence, the learned Dr. Whitby supplied his place, in overlooking and directing their studies." He was indeed obliged after a while to abandon his plan, but not from any defect essential to it.

Of other authorities, who have advocated a similar plan, I will adduce at length, two only. The first is Archbishop Leighton, whom no one will suspect of over-estimating human learning. "He thought it," we are told,* "the *great and fatal error of the Reformation,* that more of those [religious] houses, and of that

* Burnet, Hist. of his Own Times, vol. I. p. 139, and in Bishop Jebb's Lives and Characters, by Bishop Burnet, pp. 288, 9.

course of life, free from the entanglements of vows, and other mixtures, was not preserved. So that the Protestant Churches *had neither places of education*, nor retreat for men of mortified tempers."

The other writer, whom I would quote, is the learned Mr. Thorndike, who, after speaking of the other benefits which Cathedral Churches, in an efficient state, might render to their Bishops, adds, in conclusion: "If this be not enough, such may be men's abilities that all these Presbyteries may become schools of the prophets, and seminaries of able preachers through the several jurisdictions or dioceses: a thing wished on all hands, but not to be expected without means to bring it to pass. This hath always been desired at the hands of Cathedral Churches, and some steps of it remain still in some of ours; and though the staple of this education being long since drained from other places to the two Universities, the charge hath been sustained by them alone with unspeakable benefit to the Church, as well as to the Commonwealth, yet the assistance of these places with them, for the service of the Church, is not to be counted their prejudice, leaving entire unto them the place they possess, of seminaries of the Commonwealth."*

It is only necessary further to observe, that our

* The Primitive Government of Churches, p. ult., add Nelson's Life of Bull, p. 16, 17.

existing institutions are utterly inadequate for this purpose. Our Universities, which once largely contributed to the early formation of sound theologians, have long since been nearly absorbed by the duties which have, beyond all proportion, multiplied upon them, in providing a Christian and enlightened education for the whole community. Nor dare I regret this change, when I consider the importance of a sound cultivation of mind and of religious education, to the right performance of all the offices of a Christian state. There is, indeed, of necessity, in every system of education much which is incapable of receiving a *direct* Christian character. But the most powerful agencies are, every where, *indirect:* the influences which have most mightily determined the formation of our own character, or the direction of our own lives, have been in our sight *indirect;* it is part of the wonderful economy of God's providence, and one of the most amazing manifestations of His wisdom, that so many of the most important effects, in the physical or the moral world, are produced by causes, to us apparently indirect and incidental. The object of education then must be as much to guard these incidental inlets, as the more direct avenues to the mind. The teaching of religion, or religious truths, is but a small part of religious or Christian education. Christianity is not an insulated system, which can, like any scheme of philosophy, be taught apart or

by itself: a true Christian education requires the formation of the whole character on Christian principles, the imparting of all truth in a Christian spirit. It has, on this ground, been a blessed circumstance for this country, that education has, even in points not directly connected with Christianity, been to so great a degree carried on by the Clergy: it has been a happy thing, that our philologians have, with one exception, been Clergy; because every thing is capable of being treated of in a Christian manner, or the reverse; and the profession of the Clergy affords a guarantee, that these studies, though in themselves secular, should lead men up to Christianity, not estrange them from it.

Although, on these grounds, I dare not regret the number of Clergy, who have been in some measure diverted from the direct duties of their profession, or that establishments, which were intended principally to promote the study of theology, are now dedicated to purposes of Christian education, still it is of the utmost importance, that we should be aware of the change which has gradually, but on that account the more effectually, taken place in our institutions; lest we should suppose, that because we have the same names, we have, on that account, the same institutions which we had at the time of the Reformation; that they are as well calculated to produce a Jewell or a Hooker, now as formerly. Our increased population demands increased labourers, and a large proportion

of the members of our Collegiate foundations leave us as early as they may, to discharge these offices: of those who remain, several are employed in the same duties in Oxford or the neighbouring villages: but far the greatest part are absorbed in different stages of the fatiguing and exhausting duties of elementary instruction; which leave neither leisure nor strength for any deep study of theology. In consequence of all these demands, it is become a rare thing for any one to reside at the University, as did our old Divines, for the sake of theological study: there are very few, also, who can engage so partially in the duties of tuition, as to leave themselves leisure for learned or continuous thought on theology. Cranmer judged very wisely,* "as concerning the reader of Divinitie and Humanitie, it will not agree well that one man should be the reader of both lectures. For he that studieth in Divinitie must leave the reading of (lecturing in) profane authors, and shall have as much to doe as he can, to prepare his lecture to be substantially redde. And in like manner he that redeth in Humanitie, hath not need to alter his studie, if he should make an erudite lecture." The theology of our country has

* Burnet on the Reformation, Records, Part III. No. 65. Cranmer, when condemning (as Lord Henley has quoted him, Plan, p. 35, 6.) the Prebendaries, wished to abolish them as sinecurists only; for he proposes the substitution of "twenty divines, like as it is appointed to be at Oxford and Cambridge, in the stead of the said Prebendaries."

consequently ceased for the most part to be the immediate produce of our Universities, nor can it to any great extent again become so. We have not, then, at the Universities, institutions adequate to the purposes of clerical education.

Filled, moreover, and overflowing as our Colleges already are, it would be impossible to find in them any room for the students of theology: yet, if they be not admitted into the Colleges, the expenses of a residence at the Universities would be necessarily far greater than in a provincial town. But above all, individual superintendance, and that intimate intercourse, by which might best be formed the characters of the future Clergy, would be altogether lost. The Universities might naturally be *two* of the places appropriated for this purpose, and a Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and one of Practical Theology, be appointed in addition to those already existing; but alone they could not suffice. Two Canonries of Christ Church might be set apart for the additional Oxford Professors, and to the instruction in practical theology the care of one of the large parishes, of which that Chapter are patrons, might naturally be annexed; nor would there perhaps be any objection to provide for those at Cambridge in the adjacent Cathedral of Ely.

There is one other plan which I have heard proposed for clerical education, and which it may be right to notice, since it has appeared desirable to

some well-judging men, and, in despair of seeing any other adopted, once did so to myself. This is, that the general education of the under-graduate members of the Universities, should close at the end of the second year, (which is now allowed to noblemen as a privilege,) and that the candidates for Orders should employ, in the exclusive study of Divinity, the two remaining years of their under-graduate life. This would add but half a year to the residence now required of any one who wishes to take his M. A. degree; and the one objection which now presses so heavily, the probable increased expense to the candidates for Orders, would be removed. The plan seems to me now, on maturer thought, to be objectionable upon the three following grounds:—1. That a number of the students when of two years' standing, i. e. about the age of twenty, have not determined upon their future profession; and unformed as they then often are, in mind, in habits, and, unhappily, in moral and religious feelings, it might be injurious that they should. The last academical year is often the most important of the whole for the formation of the character. 2. The theological instruction communicated to them, must, at that age, either be too mature for them, or too elementary, as a preparation for their future profession. In the one case, under the semblance of doing much, we should in reality effect little more than at present, and only, by glossing over

the surface of our ills, thereby the more effectually prevent their remedy: in the other, we should fall into the great evil of the German, and (according to Dr. Chalmers,*) of the Scotch University education, that "it is brought to bear upon a wrong period, on a period immature for the application of it." 3. It seems very inexpedient, in these days, when the education of every class in society is being elevated beyond all proportion to former times, to reduce, in the case of the Clergy, that general education by which the mind is best formed. There may be cases in which it may be expedient to sacrifice this; but, as a system, I should think even our self-education better than one thus premature.†

* Chalmers on Endowments, p. 87, comp. pp. 69, 70.—"We are weak throughout," he says feelingly, "because we are weak radically." But for this, the Scotch system would have preserved more faithfully than any other the wise character of the original institutions, since it retains both the introductory and the professional portion of University education.

† "The preparatory studies of philosophy and classics must not be neglected for Divinity in the first four years; for they are the foundation, without which a man can hardly be a *judicious*, it is certain he cannot be a learned, Divine."—Waterland's Advice to a Young Student, sec. 5. Works, vol. 5, pp. 310-11. To this concise but important statement I would also add the powerful language of Bishop Kaye, (Charge, 1831, pp. 25, 26.)—"I should deeply regret any change that gave to the studies of our Universities more of a strictly professional character. My view—which was also the view of those wise and learned men who prescribed the course of academical studies—my view of those studies is,

Two difficulties only have occurred or been suggested to me in the execution of this plan; and those rather as points to be guarded or considered, than as decided impediments. The one is the supposed danger of contamination, to which the

that they are designed to discipline the mind of the student; to form in him habits of patient and persevering attention, and of accurate reasoning; to communicate to him those general principles, without the knowledge of which it is scarcely possible successfully to engage in any literary pursuit; to lay, in a word, the foundation on which the structure of professional learning is afterwards to be raised. A strictly professional education, commenced at too early a period, has, for the most part, a tendency to cramp the mind, to narrow its views, to subject it to the trammels of system, to dispose it to acquiesce without examination in the conclusions laid before it, perhaps even to unfit it for the task of examination. The advantages derived from it are rather of a mechanical character: it places a set of tools in the student's hands, and renders him expert in the use of them; but their application is confined within narrow limits. Observe, on the contrary, the quickness and energy with which one whose education has been conducted on a more liberal plan applies himself to professional studies; he displays at once an aptitude to any pursuit, however foreign to his former occupations; nothing comes amiss to him; he soon places himself on a level, in extent of professional learning, with those whose life has been directed to that single object: while, in the application of his learning to practice, he possesses an incalculable advantage, in the power which the habit of close and accurate reasoning confers, of seizing at once the important point of every question, and in the copiousness of illustration, which his stores of general knowledge supply."—The Bishop of London also says, that the scheme of theological "need not interfere with the accustomed course of academical study."

students might be exposed in large towns, such as are most of those in which the Cathedrals are situated; the other, the additional expense, which it is thought would be entailed upon parents, often ill able to afford it.

1. The first were, indeed, a very fatal obstacle, were there any ground to apprehend it; since all learning, or even practical knowledge of their profession, would be a miserable recompense for any diminished purity of thought or of conduct. Yet although this must have had some weight, were the students now first brought from their fathers' house, and to be exposed to dangers before unknown to them; it can hardly have any force, now that an University education is made essential to the entrance into the Church, and the candidates for Orders will have but the same difficulties to contend against, and increased strength to subdue them. At the same time, any regulations might be made, corresponding to those to which they have been accustomed at the Universities, and tending to secure strict propriety of conduct, or, if need be, the removal of the evil-doer from among them. The Dean and Canons, their immediate ecclesiastical superiors, might (with whatever modifications might be thought adviseable) be invested with authority corresponding to that of the Governors of Colleges in this place. A stricter adherence also to all decency of conduct, a more scrupulous avoidance of all 'appearance of evil,'

may without any imputation of harshness, be then required. These students have, by their own act, singled themselves out from the world to be teachers of sobriety and purity and holiness, and may be required surely to abstain from every thing which may cast suspicion on their own earnestness. But, after all, the main reliance must be placed, under God's blessing, upon the holy studies to which they are now dedicated, their near approach to the holy profession to which they are now all but called, the sacred duties in which they are engaged. Some there will, it is to be feared, always be, who, having put their hand to the plough, will look back; but where is this the more likely to take place,—in a mixed society of persons, many of whom have no definite purposes upon which to employ their existence, many others have merely secular objects, or where they shall be associated with those only who have the same high calling as themselves?

This same consideration furnishes, in a great measure, an answer to the other difficulty, the supposed expense to the parents. Since by far the greater part even of University expenses are occasioned by the weakness and want of self-control in the students themselves.* In these institutions,

* Persons, unacquainted with the Universities, would be astonished at the smallness of the expenses really necessary, as long as the student can reside within the Colleges. The chief necessary expenses, (those which pass through the Bursar's hands,

instruction would of course be gratuitous: the expense of lodging might be diminished, and the general purposes of these institutions furthered by the erection of buildings for the students, at the expense of the Chapters, as is now being done for those of another class at Durham. The plan would then, in any case, scarcely involve any necessary expenses beyond those which would be required under the parent's own roof; and the unprincipled expenses which are now often incurred (unprincipled, because, at least, sacrificing to selfishness, a parent's comfort) might, it is hoped, be there discontinued. There, at least, would be withdrawn the temptation to imitate expenses, which in another rank of life are lawful, but which in them become sinful, because they become selfish, and often dishonest.

The expense involved would then be slight, even if it were *additional* expense; but since parents now (those especially whose circumstances are to be considered) do actually delay the University education as long as possible, in order to leave as little interval as may be, between the period of taking the degree and that of entering into Orders, there would, on this plan, be in such cases a positive diminution of expense. For this proposal would not prolong education in such cases; it would only alter

including room-rent, tuition, dues, boarding, coals, servants, washing,) have in one of the principal Colleges in Oxford, been calculated at 70 or 80*l.* per annum.—*Berens' Letters*, p. 81.

its arrangement: the University education would commence at what is perhaps the most desirable age, about 18; the professional would but occupy the two years between the close of that education, and the earliest period at which the individual could by law enter into Orders. Lodging, then, and instruction being by this plan gratuitous, the subsequent education at the Cathedral might be made less expensive than that of the school.

There might, indeed, still be detached cases, in which this education might cause additional expense, where all expense should be avoided. And this might in some degree be remedied by exhibitions, to be gradually formed out of the Cathedral funds, for poor and meritorious students, as was indeed suggested by Cranmer.* The Bishop, also, as he has now the discretion of dispensing with the University education, in such cases as he may think adviseable, so naturally would he also, with regard to the professional. Nor is it to be overlooked, that students, really deserving, in that their cha-

* In the letter above quoted, he proposes that there should be "twenty students in the Tongues, and in French, to have ten marks a piece: for if such a number be not there resident, to what intent should so many Readers (the above twenty Divines) be there." In the "Boke of the erection of the King's Newe College at Elye" (given in Bentham's Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Ely, App. No. 34.) provision is made for "four studentes in Divinitie." The number of students who enjoy assistance in the German Universities, exceeds that in our own.

racters would be sooner and more accurately known, would be likely to meet with earlier promotion, and thus any additional expense would be amply recompensed. Certificates from these institutions, according to the degree of their testimony, would probably be of service as recommendations for the office of domestic tutor, or might have weight even with lay patrons. Yet, after all, it must be said, the difficulties of individuals cannot be set against the good of the whole. If it be essential that a Clergy should be well-instructed in the things of God, then it is no answer, that it is inconvenient, or difficult for them to become so. We argue not thus in any profession, in which our earthly welfare is concerned.

IV. I have thus ventured to state one way in which our Cathedral Institutions might render especial service for these times, and might remove a great and crying evil in the Church: but I would not be understood to represent this as the only mode in which they might be serviceable, or to imply that they had not hitherto been so. History bears witness to the contrary; and upon some of these uses I have already touched. In whatever degree they may, in these latter days, have failed of their ends, (and notwithstanding all abuses, they have still in many cases been eminently useful,) a vicious system of patronage has been the only cause. By them Christianity was

first planted in our land; by them it has since been watered. In whatever light we view them, whether in the direct services which they have rendered to the places where they are established, or indirectly in the benefits conferred upon the Clergy generally—or again as places, in which eminent men might prepare for the higher and more responsible duties of the Church—or as giving opportunity and leisure for the equally laborious, though less active, duties of Divines and defenders of our Faith—or as furnishing maintenance for other offices in themselves inadequately provided for—or lastly, as holding forth an incentive to higher theological attainments—in every way, they have rendered great and important service. Nor is even this last motive a mercenary ground. The practical and learned provinces of theology, although they naturally melt insensibly into each other, since the end of all learning is practice, still are necessarily distinct. In every division of theological study, there will be one degree of study necessary for him who wishes to employ his knowledge on practical duties, another for him who takes for his object the improvement or extension of the study itself. Upon this second division of study, the parochial Clergyman, who has rarely any prospect of leisure sufficient to carry on his researches, naturally would seldom enter: for him it would be mere consumption of time and strength to engage in pursuits in which

he could come to no result. Offices, then, such as the foreign Professorships, or our Cathedral Institutions, act as incentives to laborious theological exertion, not as holding out a sordid prospect of advancement, but because they secure to those who engage in these labours, the means of persevering in them. They open a field for exertions of this sort; they guarantee, as far as any thing human can, that the labours commenced shall not be in vain; they render these pursuits the continued duties and profession of life. "Such objects as these never can be carried on without endowments. The leisure and independence of the man, who wields these high services must, in some way or other, be secured."* A demand is thus created for productions of this nature, which since few can beforehand appreciate their value, so, in default of institutions of this sort, few individuals would encourage or support. When Archbishop Laud procured the annexation of a Canonry of Christ Church to the Hebrew Professorship,† "by means thereof the Hebrew and Chaldaic tongues, which few in Oxford understood some years before the said time, became to be so generally embraced, and so cheerfully studied, that it received a wonderful proficiency, and that, too, in a shorter time than a man could easily imagine; so great a spur doth the hope

* Chalmers on Endowments, p. 52.

† Wood's Annals, tom. ii. B. 2, p. 850.

of honour and preferment give to arts and languages." For before this time, the annual stipend of the Professorship being 40*l.*, no one, unless otherwise provided for, could give himself up to these studies.

These institutions, then, were the nurseries of most of our chief Divines, who were the glory of our English name; in them these great men consolidated the strength which has been so beneficial to the Church: to them and to our Universities are our Church and Nation indebted for the mightiest works, which have established her faith or edified her piety. It is natural, indeed, that lay writers should not be much acquainted with the earlier details of our Church; that they should be content to know that we had mighty men, to whom all Christendom was much indebted, and not care to inquire what particular offices in the Church they may have filled; it is natural they should turn to the list of the present Dignitaries of our Cathedrals, instead of tracing out the unobtrusive history of our great Divines; and it is equally natural that, conceiving that there is so much abuse at present, they should hastily conclude that it had always been so. Yet the question is an historical one, and must be decided by history. Whether, then, we take a list of our great Divines, and trace their earlier history, or whether we adopt the more compendious plan of looking over the history of our Cathe-

drals, and selecting the great names which there occur, we shall come to the same result, that to our Endowments, and principally to those of our Cathedrals, we are indebted for almost all the theology of our Church. It may be dry to review a catalogue of names: but there is no more compendious way of arriving at some insight into the truth; and those, who have to decide on the utility of these institutions, may well impose upon themselves the pains to see what fruit they have borne. It is also a refreshing sight, cheering alike to faith and hope, to behold what heroes God has already raised up for this our Church.

On opening then Willis' History of the Cathedrals, before the year 1728, when the account closes, there occur in the Cathedral of Christ Church alone, the names of *Hammond*, *Sanderson*, *Gastrell*, *South*, Smalridge, Samuel and *John Fell*, Aldrich, Archbishop Wake, Archbishop *Potter*, *Allestree*, Owen, *Pococke*, Tanner, and Hyde; among the Deans of Peterborough again, are *Jackson* [on the Creed], Cosin [Scholastical History of the Canon], *Simon Patrick*, and Kidder; among the Canons, *Lively* (one who was most depended upon in the present translation of the Bible), and Thomas Greaves, an eminent Professor of Arabic in this place. In Ely, further, we find *Bentley*, among the Archdeacons; among the Prebendaries, Archbishop *Parker*, *Whitgift*, Bishop *Pearson*, *Spencer*, *Lightfoot*. Among the Prebendaries of

Canterbury, again, we find *Ridley*, Alexander *Nowell*, Samuel Parker, Tillotson, *Stillingfleet*, *Castell* [Polyglot Bible and Lexicon], Beveridge, *Mill* [Gr. Test., &c.]; (besides that it gave refuge to Isaac Vossius, the Casaubons, Saravia, the friend of Hooker and Whitgift, and one of the translators of our Bible, Ochinus, and Du Moulin, as Windsor did to De Dominis, and the Cathedral of Oxford to a much brighter name, *Peter Martyr.**) Nor have we, as yet, even among names so valuable, included many of the most revered of our Divines: besides these, among members of Cathedrals, (I mention such names as occur, many I have omitted,) were *Chillingworth*, *Bull*, *Waterland*, *Cudworth*, Archbishop *Laud*, Bishop *Andrews*, P. Heylin, Dean Barlow, Bishop Bilson, *Hales* (of Eton), Bishop Gibson, Reynolds, and in a corresponding situation in the Irish Church, Archbishop *Usher*, as in later times Dean Graves and Archbishop Magee; B. *Walton* [Polyglot Bible], *Fox* [Acts and Monuments], Bramhall, Atterbury, Allix, Bishop *Butler*, *H. Prideaux*, Shuckford, Bishop Hall, Bishop Conybeare, Bishop Newton, William Lloyd (Bishop of St. Asaph), Bishop and

* "The Reformed in France and the Low Countries do sufficiently testify, how much they desire that they were partners of the like prosperity, because many of their rarest scholars have found great relief and comfort by being installed Prebendaries in our Cathedral and Collegiate Churches."—*Dr. Hacket's Speech before the House of Commons*, p. xxiii.

Dean Chandler, the Sherlocks, the Lowths, Bishop Hare, Dean Comber, Bishop Wilkins, Cave, Outram, Mangey, Jenkin, Derham, Biscoe, Chapman [Eusebius], Balguy, Whitby, Bullock, Warburton, Zachary Pearce, Bishop Fleetwood, Horsley, Horbery, Kennicott, Randolph, Holmes [LXX], Dean Milner, &c.—so that with the exception of Bingham, who says of himself, "I reckon* it not the least part of my happiness, that Providence having removed me from the University, where the best supplies of learning are to be had, placed me in such a station as gives me opportunity to make use of so good a library (Winchester), though not so perfect as I should wish;"—with this, and the exception of those who were Heads of Colleges, as Barrow, or constantly resided at them, as Mede or Hody, it would be difficult to name many authors of elaborate or learned works, who were not members of Chapters. In other cases, it ought also to be considered, that the foundation for the great works of former days was laid during the long residence at the University.† A small

* Preface to his Christian Antiquities.

† The degree of preparation, which was in former times made at the Universities, is conveyed the more strongly in the following passage of George Herbert (about 1630), because the passage itself is a warning against relying upon it. "Of pastors,—*some live in the Universities, some in noble houses, some in parishes residing on their cures.* Of those who live in the Universities,—some live there in office, *some in a preparatory way*, whose aim and labour must be not only *to get knowledge*, but to subdue and

country cure leaves ample leisure for digesting materials already collected during years, although it is unfavourable to the origination of any extensive work. Thus Hooker, having spent 17 years at the University, where he laid the foundation of his immortal work,* and having planned it while Master of the Temple, could complete it at a small country living: and Jewell, having resided 19 years at Oxford, and spent the period of his banishment

mortify all lusts and affections; and not to think that when they have read the *fathers*, or schoolmen, a minister is made, and the thing done. The greatest and hardest preparation is within."—*Country Parson*, ch. 2. To this might be added the ideal which he gives (c. 5) of a "Country Parson's" learning: "The country parson hath read the fathers also, and the schoolmen, and the later writers, or a good proportion of all, out of all which he hath compiled a book, and body of divinity, which is the storehouse of his sermons—this being to be done in his younger and preparatory times, it is an honest joy ever after to look upon his well-spent hours."

* It is remarkable that we can, in this instance, trace the origin of this great work in the following incidental notice of his biographer: "His pupils left the College and Mr. Hooker to his studies, in which he was daily more assiduous, still enriching his quiet and capacious soul with the precious learning of the philosophers, casuists, and schoolmen, and with them *the foundation and reason of all law*, both sacred and civil; and, indeed, with such other learning as lay most remote from the track of common studies; and as he was diligent in these, so he seemed restless in searching the scope and intention of God's Spirit revealed in the Sacred Scripture."—*Walton's Lives*. Archbishop Whitgift gave him a minor prebend in Salisbury, "to make him capable of better preferment in that Church," had he not been taken away at the early age of 46.

as Vice Master of a Protestant College at Strasburg, could complete his amid the cares of a Bishopric. Beveridge's learned works, on the other hand, with one exception, date before he was removed to the care of an important parish. Chillingworth, again, who was afterwards a Prebendary, and, at a later period, Leslie, had no parochial cures; and the evil times in which he lived, allowed Jeremy Taylor little continuance in such duties.

It can moreover be shewn, with regard to the vast majority of the great men above-named, that the Cathedral preferment was bestowed upon them, as the reward indeed of their early diligence, but not for the productions for which we now reverence them; that these works were the offspring of that preferment; that it was as members of our Cathedrals that they completed their mighty undertakings.* Nor does it diminish the proof of the utility of these preferments, that they were, *in some detached cases*, only the recompense of past labours, and, being bestowed at a late period of life, did not directly contribute to the production of any work. The effect was not, on that account, lost upon others. I would not attach undue importance to secondary motives; the highest and purest will ever be the most efficacious also. Yet can it, or ought it to be no motive to exertion, that men may hope to shew that the sacrifices of friends, the benevolence of patrons,

* See the Tables at the end, Appendix B.

the labours of instructors, have not been thrown away? Or shall the hope of a situation, which confers influence, be no right ground for exertion to those who honestly purpose to use that influence to the honour of God? Of our late Divines, it is particularly mentioned that in 1777 a minor stall of St. Paul's was expressly given to Bishop Horsley as an *encouragement*, in 1785 a stall at Gloucester as a reward; and that Dr. Kennicott, in commencing his vast task, looked forward confidently to the reward which he obtained.

Those, moreover, whose works have been transmitted to us, and form the main part of our present theology, are but a small portion of the eminent men who were fostered by our Chapters. Any one, who has not examined the subject, and shall look over any records of Cathedral Churches,* will be much surprised, when, besides the well known and familiar names which he has been accustomed to revere, he observes, how many there are, to whom the character of great learning, as well as of deep piety, is ascribed. "All these were honoured in their generations, and were the glory of their times," although now "they have no memorial," and in man's sight "have perished as though they had never been." In their own age they were burning and shining lights: they ful-

* Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy, which gives only an account of those who were at one time expelled from their Prebends, might be consulted for the same purpose.

filled their allotted portion in transmitting to other hands the sacred torch of divine knowledge, which shall beam from one end of the Christian course to the other; and though their own lamp be extinguished, still it is in part to them that we are indebted for the light with which we are now surrounded. It may suffice to name the single instance of John Prideaux, Divinity Professor in this place, who, in his own days, had so great reputation, that theological students from foreign Universities flocked to his lectures.

If again we try the question in some other way, and examine who, in former times, were the persons selected for great and important undertakings, we shall find that they were the members of endowed foundations. Of the forty-seven persons who were entrusted with the re-moulding of our English version, and produced that beautiful and classic work, which of all translations most breathes the spirit of the Divine original, of these forty-seven, five* only were parochial Ministers without Cathedral preferment, the rest, so far as is known, were either members of Cathedrals, or Professors, Heads, or Fellows of Colleges. In like manner those selected to assist the Bishops in the Hamp-

* Two even of these were also Fellows of Colleges, and one an Archdeacon; see the details in Fuller's Church History, book x. Wood's Athenæ Oxon. will mostly supply what is there omitted. There were three others, who held parochial cures, but with Cathedral preferment.

ton-Court Conference, were mostly Deans ;* as of the nine Divines, whom Queen Elizabeth selected for the Westminster Conference with the Roman Catholics, six had, before their expulsion, Cathedral preferment, Jewell and Guest were Fellows of Colleges ; of one only the station is not known.†

On this head, however, Bishop Hacket will probably be taken as a competent witness, since he spoke of what he must have well known, and he spoke before those, who must have been able to refute him, had he spoken untruly. When the Bill, namely for abolishing Deans and Chapters, was brought into the Long Parliament, Dr. Hacket was appointed to maintain their cause before it. His speech, it is said, had so great weight, that "had the aliening of such lands been then put to the vote, some (who conceived themselves knowing of the sense of the House) concluded that it would have been carried on the negative by more than six score suffrages."‡ The only question,

* "To this Conference were summoned by letters eight Bishops, besides the Archbishop, six Deans of Cathedral Churches, besides the Dean of the King's Chapel, two Doctors of Divinity, and one Archdeacon."—*Strype's Life of Whitgift*, b. iv. c. 31.

† See Strype's Annals, p. 87, and for the Divines, who are now less known, the Biograph. Brit. and Wood's Ath. Oxon.

‡ Fuller's Church Hist. book xi. p. 179, where he gives an epitome of the speech. The whole speech, which is worth reading, is given in Plume's Life of Hacket, prefixed to his Century of Sermons, p. 18—25, and from it the following extracts are taken. In the life, it is said that the question *was* negatived.

it should be remarked, at that moment agitated between the two parties, related to the application of these funds, the one "being for continuing such lands to their *ancient*, the other for diverting them to other, but neither for alienating them from publique and pious imployments." The sequel, when no defence was allowed, need not be told. Dr. Hacket, then, pleaded thus upon *this* point:

"In the third place, Mr. Speaker, I shall name that, whose use and conveniency is so nearly and irrefragably concerned by the prosperity of Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, that it is as palpable as if you felt it with your hand; and that's the advancement and encouragement of learning."—"And first, our principal Grammar Schools in the kingdom are maintained by the charity of those Churches, the care and discipline of them is set forward by their oversight, fit masters are provided for them, and their method in teaching frequently examined; and great cause for it;—so that these young seminaries of learning depend upon them, and would come to lamentable decay, if they had not such governors. For the next rank of young students that are to begin the study of Divinity, it must be confessed by all men that are conversant in the general experience of the world, that they will be far more industrious when they see rewards prepared which may recompense the costs which they put their friends to in their education, and make them some recompense for their great labours."—"Upon the fear* and jealousy that

* In Trinity College, Cambridge, six students only were admitted "from Alholland day to Easter Eve," instead of seventy or eighty.

these retributions of labour should be taken away from industrious students, the Universities of the realm do feel a languor and a pining away already in both their bodies."— "Let any man ask the booksellers of Paul's Churchyard, if their books (I mean grave and learned authors) do not lie upon their hands, and are not saleable. There is a timorous imagination abroad, as if we were shutting up learning in a case, and laying it quite aside. Mr. Speaker, if the bare threatening make such a stop in all kind of literature, what would it work if the blow were given?"— "The third rank are those that are the chariots and horsemen of Israel, the champions of Christ's cause against the adversary by their learned pen: and those that have left us their excellent labours in this kind, excepting some few, have either been the Professors and Commorants in the two Universities, or such as have had preferments in Collegiate and Cathedral Churches, as I am able to shew by a catalogue of their names and works. For such, and none but such, are furnished with best opportunity to write books for the defence of our religion. For, as in the Universities, the society of many learned men may be had for advice and discourse, so when we depart from them, to live abroad, we find small academies in the company of many grounded scholars in those foundations; and it is discourse that ripens learning, as the spark of fire is struck out between the flint and the steel. There, likewise, we have copious and well furnished libraries to peruse, learned authors of all kinds, which must be consulted in great causes: and they that have such great business in their heads, it is needful that they have *otium literarium*, a retirement to their studies, before they can bring that forth which will powerfully convince gainsayers."

But if it was difficult, then, for a parochial Minister to find leisure and opportunity, and books for any elaborate work, how much more now, when the apparatus of books required is so much larger, the residence at the Universities so much diminished, and above all, when the increase of population has created so much new and exhausting parochial duty. In no portion, in fact, of the Christian Church, are the parochial Ministers, however well instructed, the literary Clergy. Even in Germany, where more than in any other country, they do engage in literary pursuits, the main portion of written theology is the production of Professors; and the contributions of the parochial Clergy of the present day are dearly purchased by the almost universal omission of any intercourse with their flock: the occasional offices of the Church are indeed enforced by exhortations to those who attend them: otherwise the preparation of the young for Confirmation, (which is universal, and I believe admirably and carefully made,) is the only parochial duty of the German Clergy.

In Holland, again, and in Switzerland, in Denmark and Sweden, the parochial Clergy are not the Theologians; in Scotland, we have the authority of Adam Smith and Dr. Chalmers,* that almost all their literature is professorial: of theo-

* In his work on Endowments, p. 52, 3, and Note C.

logical literature they have next to none, and this little has been chiefly the produce of the Universities.* It is not their reproach, that this is so:

* An Edinburgh Reviewer, advocating Lord Henley's Plan, and wishing to establish that endowments are not necessary, takes occasion to deny a similar assertion, which had been made by Mr. Rose; and produces, as instances to the contrary, Campbell, Robertson, Reid, Playfair, Gerard, Watson, Small, Blair, Ferguson. Yet nothing could bear out the assertion more, than such a selection of names: Gerard and Campbell alone, of the above, are theological writers, for Blair's Sermons are scarcely to be mentioned; and with the exception of Robertson's History of Scotland, all their works were written by them when attached to Universities, most also as the substance of their lectures. Reid, moreover, whose case is much insisted on, felt himself so little qualified for the ministerial office, that he preached not his own sermons, but those of Tillotson and Evans. (Biographie Universelle, art. *Reid.*) Campbell, moreover, and Gerard both wrote their works as members of a literary society, established by Reid at Aberdeen. Campbell had been four years Principal of Marischal College, and Gerard six years Professor at the same, before either published his first work. Nine years had elapsed since Gerard's son had been called to his father's chair at Aberdeen, before his work (Elements of Biblical Criticism) was published. It is hardly necessary, for this object, to speak of the rest of these authors. They were not professional writers, and therefore their works are of no account, as to the question how the theological wants of a Church may be provided for. Blair's "Lectures," as their name implies, were the result of professorial labours, and published in his old age. Robertson wrote his works, with the above exception, as Principal of the University of Edinburgh, and Chaplain of Stirling Castle, and King's Historiographer. Reid published his first work after he had been eleven years Professor at Aberdeen, and one at Glasgow. Ferguson, who never obtained

they have done what they could: they have furnished exemplary Christian pastors; but those funds which might have fostered Scotland's Divines, endowed seminaries, provided Christian instruction for her higher classes, enabled her Ministers to influence them, and doubled the glory and the treasures of our British theology, by adding the results of Northern acuteness to English soundness of judgment, all were swept away in an unprincipled and greedy spoliation; and the wealth, which might have been returned ten-fold to the nation, in the blessings of sound and religious learning, was thoughtlessly sunk, to increase the profitless expenditure of individuals.

Are these, then, times in which we may content ourselves with one avenue only of introducing Christianity to the minds of the people, the direct ministrations of the Clergy, and omit that other

any parochial cure, wrote his, after having been Professor eight years. Watson (if he also is to be named) published his History of Philip but three years before his death, after he had filled different Professorships. It remains then true, as Mr. Rose asserted, that "excellent and exemplary men as were many of the Ministers of the Scottish Church, it has had few writers of any celebrity, and they have been almost all, men called away from their livings to public stations in the Universities." Of their more real Divines, Archbishop Leighton was for ten years Principal of the College at Edinburgh, and Scougal passed all his short life at Aberdeen. The only exception, which I know, is Dr. Chalmers' work on the Evidences, which he published in 1810 on a small country cure.

great instrument of influence, which is now exerting so fearful a power—the press? or shall we, again, be satisfied with such works as men can send forth in the midst of occupations which exhaust their whole strength, and think that we can therewith withstand the torrent of Naturalism, Rationalism, Socinianism, and indifference, which will, if God avert not, be poured upon our land? Shall we with 10,000 go forth to meet him which cometh with 20,000? Is this a time to diminish our labourers, or to turn our swords into ploughshares? Either service has its appropriate place: neither may we dare neglect. Our next contest will be, in all probability, with a half-learned infidelity. We have done, we may hope, with the dreams and fictions of the Dupuis' and Volneys:—there is in England too much sound common judgment for these to make any lodgment. We shall not suffer much, probably, from the shallowness of French, or from the speculations of the unsound part of German metaphysics: the one is too common-place for us, and we are too much bent upon physical science and matters of sense to employ ourselves on the other. But the struggle will, probably, be with shallow views of the older Dispensation, shallow conceptions and criticisms of Divine truths, superficial carpings at the details of Revelation, an arbitrary selection of such portion of its doctrines as may best admit of being transmuted into some corresponding doctrine

of Deistical belief. Now, this state of things is not to be remedied by mere popular treatises, for these must of necessity be superficial; but by communicating more solid and deeper knowledge, which shall raise, as well as occupy, the minds of those who receive it,—by such wisdom, as the Fathers of the English Church obtained through unwearied and uninterrupted, as well as sanctified study of Divine truth. One source which, in former times, poured forth a fertilizing stream, has already been diverted into other channels: it is not to be hoped that our Collegiate Institutions can to any extent render these, as well as those other services to which they are now mainly devoted: the only remaining provision for what every portion of the Church of Christ has thought necessary for its well-being, a learned and studious Clergy, is our Cathedral Institutions. And shall we, in such times, destroy these?

Scotland might indeed hitherto, if not advantageously, at least in comparative security, repose under the shadow of her better-provided neighbour. As the shock of every attack made upon her faith was instantly communicated to this country, both by vicinity and through the medium of our common language, every aggression upon her called forth the energies of her English ally; and if even this kindred aid were not altogether so beneficial as domestic strength, still the efforts of her own Professors were at all times readily se-

conded by support near at hand. Of late, indeed, now that Infidelity has unhappily descended from its attack upon the better instructed ranks, and assailed a class, which had hitherto been exempted from it, it has been said, that the Scotch, in the neighbourhood of their large towns, have begun to feel the want of a better instructed Clergy. At all events, Scotland can form no exception to the general rule, that one class of Clergy cannot supply all the wants of a Church; and he, who is now its brightest ornament, and is reverenced also by the Church of England, has been the first and warmest to acknowledge how much his country is indebted to our Church.* If *we* destroy our institutions, we have no human aid to look to; if we cast away the means of defence, which God has, through the piety of his former servants, put into our hands, what ground have we to look for divine?

This, then, independently of the great question of the education of our Clergy, is a solemn and important point for every Christian person, who shall be obliged to decide upon this question. Almost all our defences, either of our blessed faith itself, or of the essentials of that faith, have been the produce of our Cathedral institutions; almost every mighty work which has enriched our English theology has issued from them. Even at this very hour they are mostly their members,

* Dr. Chalmers.

from whom we have accessions to our theology: omitting writers on subjects exclusively practical, (since these would naturally be parochial clergy, and those who have minor prebends only,) I may name Bishops Van Mildert, Marsh, Sumner, Philpotts, Archbishop Laurence, Messrs. Davison, Benson, Deans Ireland, Chandler, Wodehouse, Rose, Archdeacon Goddard, Dr. Nott, Dr. Burton, Professor Lee, Messrs. Vaux, Townsend, Slade, Bishop Gray, Dr. Spry, Professor Faussett, Archdeacon Wrangham, and among the Heads of our Colleges, Dr. Routh, Bishop Copleston, Archbishop Whately, Dr. Shuttleworth, Dr. Hawkins, Bishop Kaye, Dr. Wordsworth, Dr. French; I may name also Mr. Rogers, Canon of Exeter, who, although he has as yet published but one short tract, has discovered therein a sound and accurate acquaintance with the criticism of the Old Testament.

It will appear further, even from the lists before given, that our great Divines of old were *not mere**

* I mention this the rather, because Lord Henley appears to confine the use of these institutions "to that very small portion of the theological world, which consists of retired students, fitted neither for episcopal nor for parochial duties."—Plan, p. 29. He says, indeed, that "a profound and successful pursuit of ecclesiastical and universal literature till the age of 40 or 45, will best qualify men for the episcopal office, and then will that office be their best remuneration;" but he does not say in what way a sufficient number of persons are to be enabled to pursue these studies, without the aid of the institutions which he proposes to abolish.

retired students: their studies being large, and deep, and practical, and having for their object the welfare of the Church, did not incapacitate them for her more responsible stations; they were the very means of forming the best and wisest of her Bishops: these valuable men had learnt to understand the nature of the high office which they were called to fill; through an enlightened study of the past they were best prepared to judge of the future: from the mental eminence at which they had arrived, they were best able to survey the signs of the earth and of the sky, to observe the approaching storm, whether it came from within or from without the Church—to allay its evils, if from within; to support, and cheer, and guide those over whom they were placed, when it came from without, and was inevitable.

Cathedral Institutions were accordingly the "seminaries* from which the ablest scholars were removed to Bishoprics:" nay, in this very Cathedral, I find that until the end of the last century,

* Hacket's Life of Williams, Part I. p. 204, quoted in an able article on Church Reform in the British Magazine, No. IX. p. 293.—"He had more skill, than boisterously to propound to him the extirpation of the Bishops, remembering what King James had said to the conference at Hampton Court, Anno I., *No Bishop, no King.* Therefore he began to dig farther off, and to heave at the dissolution of Cathedral Churches, with their Deans and Chapters, the seminary from whence the ablest scholars were removed to Bishoprics."

when Dean Jackson declined higher preferment, of 30 persons who were selected to preside in its Deanery, 21 were thought worthy to fill the office of Bishops: in Westminster, from Queen Elizabeth to the same period, 14 out of 16 Deans became subsequently Bishops; and of Ely, Willis says, "there is not one stall but what produced a Bishop; and near sixty Heads of Colleges in the two Universities have had Prebends in this Church." This system of gradually raising men to the most responsible offices of the Church may indeed be observed in every portion of the history of our Cathedrals.

It must indeed be admitted that the present age and the present Chapters have not been so productive of elaborate or enduring works as the golden age of our theology. And this is in part only, a subject of blame, and that blame the age must share with the Divines. In part, it has been lawfully occasioned by the sudden demand for the extensive production of a popular religious literature: in part by the habits of the present day, which would demand a general and diffusive information upon subjects wholly unconnected and dissimilar: in part, by the want of the broad and solid foundation which our ancestors laid at the Universities; and as one ground of this, by the neglect of deserving men, and the consequent absence of any well-founded expectation that laborious exertion would meet with its appropriate

recompense—the means of completing what it had commenced.

But what, if it had appeared, that in these latter days, these appointments had been, not partially only, but altogether abused, that no reform had been commenced, and Ministers had been throughout unfaithful to the trusts committed to them,—profaning, for "Parliamentary interest,* or family connexions, or party gratitude," offices which the piety of individuals consecrated for the advancement of Christianity, and the service of God,—if men had given unto Cæsar the things which are God's,—were this a reason, that we should cast them aside, as if, having once been desecrated, they were unfit for further use?—Were it not far better to dedicate them anew to the service, to which they were first appointed? Nay even, which were a far worse case, supposing that in those times when the system had been thus forced upon the Church, and it had become an almost acknowledged principle, that, in the disposal of Church Patronage, preference was to be given to friendship or relationship—some of those who had been thus appointed to its higher offices, themselves exercised their patronage in the like manner,—still this would naturally cease with the introduction of a better system, and it has already in great measure ceased. At all events, it might

* Lord Henley's Plan, p. 30.

furnish ground for protesting, in God's name, against such abuses, but could not *alone* be a sufficient reason for abolishing offices, which will render essential service to God's Church, as soon as they shall be rightly bestowed. This, indeed, as well as every other evil, will be found upon closer inspection to have been exaggerated; distance and indistinctness magnify objects. At the worst, no one would argue in any other case, that the abuse of any institution, or of any gift of God, was an argument against its use; how then, when the Church has not wilfully been thus degraded, when against its own protests its offices have been thus profaned?*

A deep debt to God and to the Church already lies upon the house of Brunswick. Much as the members of that Church must revere the virtues and blessed influence of George the Third, it is still certain that even he could not undo the evil which had been done by the ministers of the two first sovereigns of his line. It is painful to think, and one is still more reluctant to state, that the Protestant house of Brunswick did that to destroy the English Church, which neither the profligate

* "And therefore, good Madam, let not the late Lord's exceptions against the failings of some few Clergymen, prevail with you *to punish posterity for the errors of this present age;* let particular men suffer for their particular errors, but let *God and His Church have their inheritance.*"—Archbishop Whitgift's Letter to Queen Elizabeth, in Walton's Life of Hooker.

Charles the Second nor his infatuated brother ever attempted.

"With regret it must be stated," says a well-informed periodical writer,* "that, though the half century after the accession of the House of Brunswick was, perhaps, in some respects, the happiest fifty years in English history, the interests of the Church were grievously overlooked and its duties grossly neglected. It was a fatal error, when ministers thought it necessary that there should be Bishoprics of ease for men of family and fashion!† Not by such policy was the Church of England founded, and raised to its proud eminence in the Christian world; nor by such policy could it possibly be supported! From the time when this short-sighted and disgraceful system was adopted, the character of the Church declined; less intellect and less learning were called forth. The late King, speaking of the Divines of Charles the Second's age, said, 'There were giants on the earth in those days.' It was because this miserable system was pursued, that the sons of little men succeeded them; and when the feeble enjoyed what ought to have been exclusively the reward of character and talents, a decay of discipline was the natural consequence. The inferior Clergy relaxed in their respective spheres; they performed the routine, but not the duties of their office; sound learning declined; the great business of seeing that the rising generation should be grounded in the principles of religion, (on which such stress was deservedly laid by our ablest Divines of the best

---

* Quarterly Review, No. 56. "Progress of Infidelity," pp. 518, 9.

† Life of Bishop Newton.

age,) was almost wholly neglected; the population of the kingdom, meantime, more than doubled upon the Church Establishment, and these concurrent causes afforded the enemies of the Church all the facilities they could desire; the Roman Catholics, the Dissenters, the Methodists, made numerous proselytes; very many received the poison of infidelity, and still more lapsed into a state of indifference, which differed from it more in name than in reality."

A heavier charge has, indeed, been brought against the statesmen who introduced the system from which the Church has since been suffering, and whose reproach the Cathedral bodies, which have been its most lasting victims, are doomed to bear. It is, namely, that these politicians, dreading the influence of the Church, as conceiving it opposed to them and to their government, first employed writers in its own order, "under the professed design of confuting and decrying the usurpations of a Popish Hierarchy, virtually to deprive the Church of every power and privilege, which, as a simple society, she had a claim to;" next, they encouraged,* countenanced, and in one instance

* The same assertion, that, "at the accession of the present family, Government employed infidel writers expressly to write against religion, because they were afraid of the Clergy, and thought this the most likely means to draw off their attention from politics," is made by J. Boucher, in a note to his "View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution," in thirteen Discourses, preached in North America between 1763 and 1775. The above periodical Writer, who quotes him, calls him a very able and right-minded author.

pensioned, writers, who, under cover of politics, "took all occasions to vent their malice against Revelation itself;" and lastly, as the final stroke, wilfully degraded the Church, by degrading its ministers.

"For now, religion having lost its hold on the people, the ministers of religion were of no further consequence to the state; nor were statesmen any longer under the hard necessity of seeking out the most eminent for the honours of their profession. All went now according to their wishes. They could now employ Church honours more directly to the use of Government, that is, of their own, by conferring them on such subjects as most gratified their taste or humour, or served best to strengthen their connexions with the great. This would, of course, give the finishing stroke to their system. For, though stripping the Church of all power and authority, and exposing it naked and defenceless to its enemies, had abated man's reverence for it, and the detecting revelation of imposture, serving only for a state engine, had destroyed all love for religion, yet they were the *intrigues of Church-promotion*, which would make the people despise the whole ordinance."

These are the assertions, not of a disappointed declaimer, but of a learned and eminent Bishop of our Church, Bishop Warburton, in the dedication of his work* to Lord Mansfield, when Lord Chief Justice of England in 1765.

Bishop Newton makes the same complaint of

* Books IV—VI. of the Divine Legation.

this change of system in the disposal of Church preferment.

"In former times,"* he says, speaking of Archbishop Secker, "the Archbishops, or some of the Bishops, had usually the principal sway or direction in the disposition of ecclesiastical preferments; at least nothing of importance was concluded upon without first acquainting and consulting them upon it. But by degrees the Ministers of State have engrossed all this power into their own hands, and Bishops are regarded as little better than cyphers even in their own Churches, unless the preferments happen to be in their own gift, and then, perhaps, the Ministers are as troublesome by their solicitations."

It is time, that we should retrace our steps; the time past has been long enough to degrade the service of God, and make offices appointed for his honour, subservient only to the momentary and often selfish strife of worldly politics. The original contrivers of this impious system have, as will always be the case, done far more, and more lasting evil than they intended; they have degraded that portion of the Church, which before rendered the greatest service; and they have thereby lowered the Church itself: but with it they have also lowered the moral and religious, and even the natural character of our people. Let us not, by continuing their sin, entitle ourselves to the inheritance of their punishment, or because they have

* Life, p. 161, 2.

mutilated and maimed one of the fairest edifices ever erected to the service of God, ourselves waywardly destroy it, instead of restoring it in its original beauty and strength. "Upon the ruin of the rewards of learning, no structure can be raised up but ignorance: and upon the chaos of ignorance no structure can be built but profaneness and confusion."*

It will not be foreign to the subject, briefly to advert to an incidental injury, which the proposed confiscation of Chapters would do to a very valuable office in our Church, our Archdeaconries.†

* Conclusion of Dr. Hacket's speech.

† Lord Henley, in his first printed Plan, assigned to the 53 persons, to whom he proposed to commit that office, the annual sum of 41,600*l.* This was, I suppose on advice, withdrawn, and in his scheme, it is proposed that the Archdeacons' travelling expenses, which have been, on the whole, calculated at 11,377*l.* should be paid them. (Plan, No. XXIV.) This, however, is one of the parts of the Plan, which Lord Henley now thinks "may with propriety be postponed." (Union, p. 94, 5.) So that the Archdeacons would be left without any provision at all. It would be desirable that Lord Henley hereafter should distinguish *in the Plan itself*, any ulterior and contingent advantages which are to take place at some indefinite period, from those which it is hoped will be its immediate, and it is to be feared will be its only, results. For if these and other benefits, for realizing which it has been calculated that 68,585*l.* per annum would be required, and which now are to be put off to some distant day, are actually put forth as a part of the advantages of the present Plan, (see Nos. XV. XXIV. XXV.) Lord Henley will scarcely escape the imputation of holding out delusive expectations. I may add, that Dr. Burton's Plan does provide for the Archdeaconries.

The office is indeed of such high importance, and so necessary to the effectual influence of Episcopal superintendance, that it would have been well, probably, had it been permanently provided for, by being united with Cathedral preferment. The office, which is in itself poorly supported, (scarcely one, of all the Archdeaconries, I believe, pays its own expenses,) is now, in 23 cases out of 59,* sustained by the sinecure to which it is in effect, although accidentally, united. Two-fifths of the whole number of Archdeacons now actually hold Cathedral stalls: the abolition of those stalls would preclude the Archdeacon from the prospect of any such office, as might enable him to bear his expenses; and if his duties were extended to such minute inspection as is now proposed,† (and some extension might be desirable,) a large parochial cure would be incompatible with the office.

V. Upon the question, as to the *right* of abolishing Cathedral Institutions, as far as this is a question of law, I would wish to speak with especial diffidence, since the laws do not belong to my profession; except thus far, that it is the concern of

* I have not included the Archdeaconry of St. Asaph, which is merged in the Bishopric. Besides these stalls, there are united, with Theological Professorships, 3 officially, 2 incidentally; with Headships of Colleges, 4 officially, 3 incidentally; with Chancellorships, 4 officially, 6 incidentally; with Bishoprics, 1 officially, 10 incidentally.

† Plan, No. XXIV.

all ministers of Christ to urge, that the immutable laws of justice should be observed. If, in speaking on the present portion of the subject, I am compelled principally to notice the principles laid down by Lord Henley, it is with all respect to the goodness of his intentions; yet the very fact that he wishes earnestly the welfare of Christianity, while it excites the hope that he will not be offended by any observations on his Plan, renders it the more necessary that such observations should be made. Lord Henley, indeed, differing herein from most modern Church Reformers, concedes the point that Chapter property was bestowed, not by the public, but by individuals; and that therefore the question is,—not what we might imagine, would have been abstractedly the best disposition of their property (for it was their's to dispose of, not our's)—but what were their intentions, and how we may realize these intentions most efficiently. And this consequence Lord Henley fully admits.

"It may seem* a strong measure," he says, "to diminish a Chapter—to one superior and two assistant ministers. But let us ask for what end these establishments were instituted, and these endowments given? Doubtless for the religious instruction of the people. But if experience convinces us that these gorgeous edifices and their numerous train of ministers have effected, and indeed from

* Plan, p. 97.

their nature can by possibility effect, but little for the winning of souls, and the cause of vital and practical Christianity, is it not an act of duty to turn the fund into that channel, where it may substantially advance the intentions of the pious and munificent donors?"

About the origin, then, of the property of Cathedral bodies there is no question; nor indeed can there be. One need only turn to any authentic accounts of the institution of Cathedrals, to see (what is indeed true of all Church property*) that it was uniformly given not by public, but by private, piety. To turn to one instance only, in which the records have been fully published,† the Cathedral of Rochester; its property was given by a succession of individuals, some of them kings, as was natural, but many, also, private individuals: it was given moreover, not lightly and carelessly, but with all the solemnity of a deliberate act, those who were in any ways interested in the property, besides the immediate possessors, joining in the gift. The question thus becomes not a legal, but an historical one: the legal principle is granted, that the property can only be disposed of in accordance with the "clear‡ will of the donor:" it only remains to inquire what that will was.

* See Dr. Dealtry's Charge, 1831, The Church and its Endowments. Note G, and the authorities quoted there in note F.

† See Thorpe's Registrum Roffense, or Sir William Dugdale's Hist. of St. Paul's, and Cathedrals of York and Durham, and the Collegiate Churches of Ripon and Southwell.

‡ Lord Henley, Plan, p. 17.

This unquestionably was not the *direct* religious instruction of the people, but the formation of establishments wherein Ministers might be trained to their duties, and Christian studies encouraged. It may suffice, *instar omnium*, to quote the learned Bishop Stillingfleet,* whose profound antiquarian knowledge of this subject no one can doubt. "In London two churches were designed, (as it is said,) by Mellitus. Both these were called Minsters, i. e. Monasteries, for from St. Augustine's time, the clergy living together with their Bishop do bear the name of Monastery. But these were of two different kinds; that which stood in a place of retirement, as Westminster then did, was intended for a *nursery* to the *Church*, wherein persons might be bred up in a way of *devotion* and *learning*, to fit them for further service when they should be taken out: but the other was made up of those who were actually employed in the daily offices, or sent up and down by the Bishop to such places as he thought fit, for instructing the people. This seemed to have been Gregory's design, when he sent Mellitus and the rest over, that *wherever they settled a Church*, they should take care of *both*

* A (posthumous) Discourse of the true Antiquity of London, published in vol. 2, of his Ecclesiastical Cases, p. 552—6. See also his Antiquities of British Churches, c. iv. p. 202, sqq. Bishop Kennett's Parochial Antiquities of Ambrosden, &c. may also be consulted.

these foundations. So Gotselin, in his life of St. Augustin, saith, that Ethelbert after his conversion took care to establish two things, *Episcopia* and *Monasteria*, i. e. *Cathedral Churches and nurseries of religion and learning*, to fit men for the service of the Church. And that the first Monasteries here were so designed appears by the education of persons therein for the service of this Church." Having named some learned English so educated, and who succeeded Gregory's immediate disciples, in the sees of Canterbury and Rochester, Bishop S. proceeds, "These I instance to shew that before the coming in of Theodore, care was taken to breed up persons in learning for the service of the Church: and *Bede* takes care to shew how well the Monasteries were furnished to that purpose; and how he was brought up himself so, under Ceolfrid, from seven years old. He tells how many journeys to Rome, Benedict Biscop took to provide the best books for their library; and he speaks of the division of his time between praying, studying, writing, and instructing others. And when Bede speaks of Sigebert's appointing a school among the East Angles, for the education of youth, he saith, that Felix, Bishop of the diocese, provided masters and tutors for them, *according to the custom at Canterbury*.—Whence it follows, that at Canterbury, there was care taken in the monastery there founded, for masters and tutors, in order to

the education of fit persons for the Church's service. And Bede mentions the great number of books, which Gregory sent to Augustin, as soon as he heard of his success; which were laid up in the monastery of St. Augustin.—The like care, we have reason to believe, was taken in other dioceses as well as that of Canterbury and the East Angles, especially when we have such evidence of the building of a Cathedral Church and a Monastery, as there was by Mellitus in the diocese of London." To this distinct and learned statement of Bishop Stillingfleet, nothing might be added with regard to the elder times, except that even in those establishments, which, as St. Paul's, were more directly of a missionary character, provision was made for study. The duties of a residentiary of St. Paul's, besides the attendance on divine service, are said to be* "to undertake any public duties, burdens, and labour, for the common benefit of the Church; *in his leisure to give good heed to study*, to *seek wisdom*, and to feed the brethren and *the Clergy of the Church* with the word of God." The complaint, indeed, in those times, nearer to the foundation of these establishments, relates not to the too great, but to the too little, residence of the members; and the "residentiary" was one who took upon himself the duty of re-

* Dugdale's Appendix in Hist. Eccl. Cath. S. Pauli, p. 36. Quid sit residens in Ecclesia S. Pauli.

siding,* while the rest preferred pursuing their employments elsewhere.

Additional evidence upon this point is furnished by the discussions at the Council of Trent with regard to the reformation of Cathedral and Monastic Institutions. This evidence is the more important, because it refers to an universal custom, and therefore applies to all the countries in which these Institutions were formed. The question related to the *restoration* of the theological lectures in *both* these establishments. With regard to the lectures, "Some proposed," relates Paolo Sarpi,† "to *restore* the custom which existed formerly, when the Monasteries and *Chapters were simply schools*, a custom, of which there still remain traces in several Cathedrals, in which the dignities of Œcolatre or Theologal, to which Prebends were annexed, have remained in abeyance, not being conferred upon persons capable of discharging their duties. Every body then was con-

* Ib. De Canonicis in genere et unde primum nomen Residentis, p. 32 and p. 35—De residentibus in Ecclesia S. Pauli. In the Minutes of the Privy Council, directing the establishment of a divinity lecturer at Lichfield, the Chapters are told, "You cannot but acknowledge, *however by custom prevailing against law and your antient foundation, you may be excused from necessary residence,* yet in conscience and in all reasonable intendment, this is the least duty you are bound to perform to your Cathedral Church."—*Strype's Whitgift*, B. ii. Append. No. 5.

† Concile de Trente, l. ii. c. lxi.

vinced that it was useful and advantageous to re-establish the theological lectures in the *Cathedrals* and Monasteries. This seemed easy of execution in the Cathedrals, the case thereof being referred to the Bishops. But in the Monasteries there was more difficulty." The decree of reformation* accordingly bore, that, "in order that the treasure of the sacred Volume might not be neglected, the Ordinaries, in all Churches where there was any Prebend, &c. for readers in theology, should compel the holders of such Prebends, &c. to expound Holy Scripture either themselves or by a deputy to be appointed by the Ordinaries, and that no such preferments should for the future be given except to competent persons.—And further, that in the Metropolitan and Cathedral Churches, (if the place be large and populous,) and in Collegiate Churches, even though belonging to no diocese, (if the *Clergy* should be numerous,) in default of any such Institution, the first Prebend vacated, except by resignation, which shall have no duty incompatible with this, shall be, *ipso facto*, connected to this office." In *poorer* places where there were so few either of *Clergy* or people, that a lecture in theology could not be conveniently held, a Grammar-school for the Clergy and other poor scholars was appointed. "In the Monasteries *also* of the Monks,"

* ap. Pallavacino Hist. Conc. Trid. l. vii. c. ii.

the Decree proceeds, "where it may conveniently be done, lectures in Holy Scripture shall be given."

In fact, with regard to all the regulations as to study or the instruction of others, there appears to have been no difference between the Cathedral and Monastic establishments, as indeed the latter but gradually grew out of the former. Charlemagne directed his celebrated letter,* alike to the Monasteries and Episcopal foundations, exhorting them, that "beside the leading a life according to their rules, and a holy conversation, they should take heed to instruct others, who by gift of God can learn." The council of Cabillon,† A. D. 813, in referring to this admonition, speaks principally of the education of the Clergy; of those namely, "by whose teaching not divers heresies only, but the suggestions of Antichrist and Antichrist himself might be resisted." The very formation of the Universities is traced with probability to the Cathedral foundations;‡ their first studies were those of the Cathedrals; the members of Cathedrals or Monasteries their first Professors. Human learning was admitted as the handmaid only to divine. "The Cathedral and Collegiate

* The letter is given by Launoy de Scholis celebrioribus per Occidentem instauratis, pp. 6, 7, see also Sismondi's Preface to it in Baluz. Capitular. Regg. Franc. p. 201.

† Ibid. Launoy, ib. p. 8.

‡ Thomassin Discipline de l'Eglise touchant les Benefices, P. iv. l. ii. c. 34., add ib. c. 33, and P. iii. l. i. c. 19.

Churches, we are again told,* were so many seminaries in which *all the Clergy* were educated to ecclesiastical knowledge and piety."

These foundations then were originally given for the promotion of pious learning, schools being on this account in every case annexed to these establishments: nor may it be forgotten that even in the worst times they were the seats and preservers of learning.

Nor was the object of these Institutions altered at the Reformation. Even those which were now for the first time established by Henry as Cathedral foundations, were only a renovation of the Monasteries, which he had arbitrarily dissolved. And here the transference from the regular to the secular Clegy was no real change of designation: it tended only the better to secure the intentions of the founder.

The view which was then taken of those Institutions, and the objects which they were to serve, may fairly be gathered from the "Reformation† of the Ecclesiastical Laws," composed by Cranmer, although never sanctioned by authority. It is there provided that‡ "the Statutes of the *Founders* of Cathedral Churches should be kept pure

* Morinus de sacr. Ordinat. P. 3. Exerc. 13. c. 12. quoted by Thomassin, l. c.

† Reformatio Legg. Eccles. ex auctoritate primum Regis Henrici 8 inchoata, deinde per R. Edoardum 6 provecta, adauctaq. in hunc modum.

‡ l. c. p. 49. c. 7. de Ecclesiis Cathedralibus.

and entire, as they had been heretofore received, inasmuch as they do not oppose the word of God and our enactments relating to religion past or future." "The Deans,"* it is further provided, "should be *learned men*, distinguished for sound judgment, and that they should aid the Bishop within the Cathedral Church, as should the Archdeacons without, as his two most useful and necesssary members." With regard to the Prebendaries, it is prescribed† that besides taking part in the Ca-

* c. 8. de Decanis.

† c. 9. de Præbendariis. There yet exists in some Cathedrals the remains of this Institution, in the office of Divinity Lecturer, as at Carlisle and Lichfield; and this, as well as every other endowment, has, confined as it was, been productive of benefit. The learned and solid Faringdon was lecturer at Windsor. The Divinity lectureship at Lichfield was established at the instance of Whitgift, then Visitor; and the mode in which its establishment is directed by the Privy Council, implies that its previous omission was an act of negligence. "Whereas," the minutes begin, "we have understood that there is lack of an ordinary reader, very requisite and commendable in all Cathedral Churches, both for the instruction of others, and conference among themselves, and good example to the rest of the diocese; and therefore a matter, in our opinion, *requiring timely reformation:* we have hereupon thought it good, for that care we have to supply such defects, especially in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, to require you, the Dean, one to whom it doth principally belong, and other the Prebendaries, to have speedy consideration thereof." (Strype, l. c.) The well informed Editor of the British Magazine states, No. xiii. p. 193, "In some Cathedrals, lectures are still delivered by one of the Canons, whose business it is. One of them at Hereford is entitled the *Prelector*. At Chiches-

thedral service, "they should provide that the Holy Scriptures should be explained in their body three times in the week, *by a learned man and well skilled theologian*, and this either in their own persons, or by joint payment, or by *setting apart a prebend* for this purpose." From this lecture no resident member of a Cathedral was to absent himself.

The regulations, further, in the office of *Prebendaries*, are introduced by the statement that "those* who enjoyed sinecure ecclesiastical benefices, had been wont to have *a dispensation from all duties.*" This irresponsible service Cranmer, however, rightly rejects, on the principle, that "those who live on the revenues of the Church should employ themselves to benefit the Church:" and he accordingly assigns to such Canons and Prebendaries, as had no distinct offices allotted to them,† (i. e. as it is explained,‡ which had no definite cure of souls

ter, where there is a stall with the same duty attached to it, it was, as the writer knows, the determination of the present Bishop of Worcester to have provided for the delivery of a course of Divinity lectures, by the appointment, which he intended to make to the proper stall, now held by a person of advanced age and infirm, had it fallen during his time."

* P. 31. c. 16. Officium præbendariorum. "Immunitatem quandam omnium munerum habere solebant, qui beneficiis prius Ecclesiasticis fruebantur, curarum, (ut ipsi interpretati et etiam loquuti sunt) expertibus."

† "Qui certa sibi non habent in Ecclesiis dispertita munera."

‡ P. 33. c. 22. In liberioribus illis et solutioribus præbendis, quæ certos greges non curant. It was proposed that into them, persons of the age of 20 should be admissible, preparatory to priests' orders.

attached to their office, accordingly, the Canons Residentiary or Major Prebendaries) "the duty of relieving the Churches by *teaching*, preaching, comforting the distressed, or any other acts of piety and mercy, or by any other lawful ways appointed by the Bishop and the Dean." To this line of duties, the only exception is, the allowance* of five years for study at the Universities, under the condition of reporting every year to the Bishop and Chapter the progress of their studies; and this course of study is the only ground for exemption from daily attendance at Cathedral service. The schools, again, established within them, are said to be for the same great purpose of promoting Biblical knowledge, "in order† that the knowledge of God may be retained in the Church, which can hardly be attained without skill in the languages, and that ignorance may not reign among our countrymen, and *especially among the Ministers of the Church*, and that that teaching, which is the gift of the Holy Spirit, may be spread as widely as possible."

The Cathedral Institutions were then, it appears, intended in a double way to be seminaries of theological learning, both in that the Prebendaries themselves were to be engaged in such studies and to be learned men, and in that they

* Ib. p. 31. c. 17. et. p. 33. c. 22.

† P. 56. c. 1. De scholis habendis in ecclesiis Cathedralibus.

were either to communicate, or cause to be communicated, such knowledge to others. And these objects were actually realised in those first times of our Reformed Church, for, in the petition of the Archbishop and Bishops elect to Elizabeth,* against the proposed spoliation of the Church of Ely, we find them appealing to the examples of her father and brother, that "they did moche tendre the advauncement of lerning, by cherishing of students, and encowraging of Mynysters;" expressing their trust that the Queen "will be enclyned no less to the *mayntenance of lerning* for the setting furthe of Christ's true religion, now for want of sufficient Mynysters in great jeopardie of decaye," "and praying that the Bisshoppes of the new-erected Churches may geve the Prebends of those Churches *as in other is used, the rather to mayntayne lerned men* and Preachers." In 1583, Whitgift again was obliged to petition against a proposed spoliation of the Cathedral of Hereford, on the ground that Cathedral preferments were "now† the chief and

* Petition of Matthew Parker, Archbishop Elect of Cant.; Edmund Grindall, Elect of London; Richard Cox, Elect of Ely; William Barlow, Elect of Chichester; and John Scory, Elect of Hereford, to Queen Elizabeth. Published in Bentham's Cathedral Church of Ely, App. No. 32.

† *Strype's Whitgift*, B. ii. App. No. VI. In 1578, when Whitgift was Bishop of Worcester, he applied and obtained from the Queen the prebends of that Church. For hitherto, they not having been "in his dispose, but the Queen's, he could not prefer

principal rewards that were left for learned Divines."

It would appear, then, that neither at the original institution, nor at the time of the Reformation, was it intended that the Cathedral Clergy should be what they have now mostly become, a parochial, or as this class has been over-narrowly called, the "working Clergy;" as if the labours of a literary Clergy were less continuous, or less exhausting, or as if the annals of our Church did not present as many cases of those who had fallen martyrs to her service in this way as in her more direct ministrations. The reform, in truth, which is needed to restore these institutions, "according to the will of the donor," is exactly the contrary to what is now on different sides proposed. The mere Prebendary or the sinecurist, such as he is held up by unprincipled journalists, to delude or to incite the feelings of the laity, exists only in the imagination of these persons. The fact is, (the truth will soon be known more precisely) that the members of our Chapters have too little of the leisure, which it was intended they should have: they have mostly important, some very extensive and ill-endowed cures: their residence at the Cathedrals generally falls very much below the period

such to be near him *and assistant unto him*, that were *persons of good learning*, and whom he might confide in for their abilities to encounter either Papists or Puritans."—*Strype's Whitgift*, B. ii. c. 1. p. 87.

of absence, which it is even now proposed to allow *all* Clergy;* and even then they mostly preach on the Sundays. They have, in fact, no more repose than is allowed to every civil officer; they have none for works such as our ancestors produced. In truth, the Clergy are already too exclusively of one class: we have not sufficient labourers for a field, which becomes day by day more important, and whose importance they well know, who are so anxious to destroy these institutions. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*† When those who have no religion in themselves, are so eager, under pretence of furthering religion, to destroy these bulwarks, it may to us, if we will not blind

* Plan, No. XXI. In the single case, to which Lord Henley objects (Plan, p. 24), the Crown could have granted a dispensation, as it did to Castell (Heb. Prof. at Cambridge) for the same stall.

† "The testimony of an adversary is that, which may most lawfully be used to advantage. The greatest enemy of the Reformed Church of England was Sanders, in his book of English Schism, as he terms it. Consult him, p. 163, how he envies us, and snarles at us for our prosperity of those forenamed Churches; he says, that the Royal Queen did judge it for the glory of her Prelacy, for the splendour of her kingdom, for the *firmness of her sect* (so he calls our religion) that in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, she would have Provosts, Deans, Prebendaries, Canons. This was it that troubled him, when he saw these foundations conduced to the stability of religion; so that I judge by his words a fatter sacrifice could not be offered up to such as himself, than the extirpation of them."—*Bishop* (then Dr.) *Hacket's Speech*, p. xxiii, iv.

ourselves, be an evidence of their value. This, however, is certain, that the estates or the tithes which were bestowed upon these bodies, were *not* given for the purposes of providing a parochial Ministry, otherwise they would have been given to the places themselves, not to these corporations. Under whatever plea then it may be attempted to apply the property of any ecclesiastical corporation to this purpose, and divert it from those, to which its donors destined it, it must be on some other ground than that of the "clear will of the donor."

It is said, indeed, that "no one* now maintains the inviolability of corporate rights, when a clear case of public necessity or expediency demands their sacrifice." It may be so, although I should be sorry to see that variable and ever-shifting weathercock, called public expediency, made the compass by which we should steer our course. Corporate *rights* are derived from the public, and it may be said that the public have a right to resume what they bestowed; but is the case the same with corporate *property?* Does no one now maintain its inviolability? Is it now esteemed that the public have a right to take what they never gave? and because private individuals, instead of aggrandizing their own families, bestowed portions of their property in promoting the public good, in the way in which they thought most

* Lord Henley, Plan, p. 17.

beneficial, does it follow that it so becomes public property, that it may be converted, *against the will of the founder*, to a different class of objects, merely because those objects are of undoubted importance? If so, what shall prevent the public from assuming all the corporate property in the kingdom; and as it is now proposed to employ the property given by individuals to certain ecclesiastical bodies, for other services in the Church, so to divert to the purposes of the state that given to civil corporations? Why should the property of the Corporation of London be more exempt than that of St. Paul's? Or why should not the estates of the Ironmonger's Company be just as liable to be applied to the services of the state, or to the London University, as any Cathedral property, to purposes for which its donors never intended it? And not these only, but why should not every sum of money, which the liberality or beneficence of our ancestors left for any object of learning or of charity, be turned into any other channel, which the men of this day may think more useful, and our Collegiate or Grammar-schools be changed into places of cheaper education for our yet poorer brethren? If the step were taken,* the real ground

* Those who really wish well to the Church, should read, in some detailed history of Charles I., what the attacks upon "these outworks of Episcopacy" (Fuller, B. IX.) mean, in the minds of most men. They who mean honestly by the Church and State, are instruments only.

of difference would be, that the Church is the weakest body, and neither can nor wishes to resist; but then, *væ victis!* woe to those, the confiscation of whose property "public expediency" shall next demand! *Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur.* Nay, since the whole property of Chapters is not equal to that of one or two individuals, the precedent once set will be too convenient not speedily to be followed, and injustice, for once even-handed, will return the poisoned chalice to their own lips. It were of evil example also to those who should henceforth wish to appropriate any portion of their property to some public object, when it shall now be established, that it thereby becomes public property, and so that it be employed in some public service, however different from that for which it was intended, the 'clear will of the donor' is still consulted. This were of evil example, but that the "age of moral chivalry," and with it all idea of services, which cannot be measured and computed, and made tangible to sense, "is gone."

Public indeed these institutions are in two very important ways: 1st, that they are devoted to promote the highest interests of the public, while a larger proportion even of their incomes flows back to the public in works of charity and mercy than from any other species of property; 2d, that *they are open to the public;* that there is no one, to whom, so soon as he qualifies himself for them, every office in the Church is not open. And

those, who speak so much of the Church, as distinct from the people, would be amazed, if they examined the lives of our divines and dignitaries, and saw how many of these eminent and excellent men were the sons of tradesmen, farmers, or mechanics. These institutions alone "are* the common possession of the realm, lying open to all that will qualify themselves to get a part in them. *They are not inclosed in private men's estates, but they are the commons of the kingdom.*"

The only duty and the only right which the public have, as trustees of property set apart for charitable or religious uses, is to take care that such property be applied to the purposes to which it was originally consecrated. I speak not now of the expediency or inexpediency of allowing certain portions of property to be applied for ever to particular uses: this is not the question; but whether the state, having sanctioned such application, and allowed individuals, instead of aggrandizing their own families, to appropriate some portion of their wealth to any great and common object, have any right afterwards to change such application, and to employ those funds in any other mode which in subsequent times may be deemed more beneficial. In that the state permits any such application to be made, it pledges its own good faith to guarantee its continuance. The state may place (as it has placed with regard to

* Dr. Hacket's Speech.

the possession of land) what limitations it may please on the accumulation of property for particular purposes; but when it has sanctioned the appropriation, it has no longer any right, in common honesty and integrity, to withdraw that sanction, and convert to other ends the property which, in reliance upon its truth, has been bestowed. Its only office now is, to see that the intentions of the founder be executed; to correct abuses, which time, or circumstances, or the changes of events, or man's corruption, may have introduced: but in every real reform the will of that founder must be his guide; and he will have formed a very inadequate estimate of the enlarged notions of those excellent men from whom our charitable and religious foundations are derived, who shall think that the recurrence to their intentions will not be the most efficient, as it is the only honest, reform.

It was thus at the Reformation. For it was not to the Roman Catholic Church, such as it now is, or such as it was before the Reformation, that either tithes or lands were originally given. They were given to a church, if not as pure as the Church of England is at this day, yet altogether free from the superstitions of that of Rome; to one, whose doctrines the Romish Church has, only not by name, condemned.* The Reforma-

* See at length Soames' Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church (Bampton Lectures), or a short statement in the British Magazine, No. 13. p. 121, sqq. It were time

tion, then, has introduced no new principle: whatever the state then left to the Church, was bestowed strictly according to the will of the founder, on the purposes for which he had intended it, but from which it had, in the intervening period, been diverted, in whatever degree the Anglo-Romish church had departed from the purity of the Anglo-Saxon. The Cathedrals became again what their founders intended that they should be,—seats of religious learning and devotion. In whatever degree these purposes may in later times have failed of being realized, or whatever circumstances may prevent their accomplishment, in that degree and in those things reformation is required. The reformation demanded is not an outward change in the disposition of property, but an abandonment of the corrupt principles upon which patronage has been exercised: it is needed for the most part, not in the Church but in the State; it is, that those to whom this high trust is committed, should execute it as faithful and honest stewards. When the will of the founder shall

that the vulgar error, there adverted to, that any portion of our present Church property was bestowed to obtain masses for the souls of the donors, should be now exploded. The chantry lands, which were given for that purpose, were confiscated to the Crown in the reign of Edward VI. See Burnet's Reform. A. D. 1547. 2374 chantries were then confiscated, the greater part of the property squandered; (Collier, Eccl. Hist. ii. 238., Strype Eccl. Mem. b. 1. c. 8.) and the poor injured. (Heylin, Hist. Ref. p. 50, sq. 60, sq.)

again be executed, there will be no further question, whether that will was wise or no.*

The only case, in which it has ever been thought right to alter the regulations of the founder, has been when the purposes he contemplated have ceased to exist. In this case, also, it has always hitherto been held a bounden duty to appropriate the property—not to what might be thought abstractedly the best, but—to those purposes which most nearly approached the original intention of the founder. This then must be the only course to be pursued in relation to any sinecures which cannot now be applied to any of the purposes for which they were first intended. The first object must be to ascertain in each case what the intentions of the founder were; the next to apply the funds carefully and faithfully according to those

* I do not mean to say that if the Church to which the property had been left, had been a corrupt Church, there could have been any right to forfeit altogether the property, which, amid whatever error, had been consecrated to God's service. The will of the founder should still have been followed as nearly as, under the new circumstances, was possible. One might, as has been well said, as well confiscate a Professorship of Astronomy, because the system taught, though true, was not that of the founder, as sacrifice revenues dedicated to the promotion of piety, because the religious knowledge of that time was obscured. Yet this is a further principle which is not now required. The property having been left to a pure Church, we have no need to settle, how we should have had to act, had it been bestowed on one corrupt.

intentions. Such a reformation were a wholesome, were a righteous change. Any other application of any portion of Church property is but a national robbery of what the nation never gave, for purposes which the nation ought to supply, and which every other nation does supply, but to which our own has hitherto been unhappily indifferent. The greatness of the need changes not the character of actions: the amount of our necessities furnishes no plea for dishonesty to our trust. Least of all let us take credit to ourselves for anxiety to promote God's kingdom, or deceive ourselves into a belief, that we are animated by a true love for His glory, while we sacrifice to him nothing but that which is not our own, and offer to Him only what the piety of others has already consecrated to His service. It is not in such a spirit, that the sinking character of a nation was ever restored.

VI. Although, for the above reasons, I hold the existence of Chapters, or some corresponding institutions, essential to the good estate of the Church, I do not thereby mean to advocate their maintenance exactly in their present form, or the continuance of precisely their present incomes. If, upon the review which is now being made of the property and offices of the Church, it shall appear that the Chapter income is larger than it was intended to be, or should there be any offices, no longer capable of being connected with the

efficient duties, which they were intended by the Founders to perform; then let such superfluities be applied to some kindred purpose. Only let each case be dealt with separately, and not according to any sweeping theory, which, as being conceived in general terms, would probably be inapplicable to particular cases. In all instances, probably, besides the general purpose of promoting piety and pious knowledge, some distinct benefits were intended to the places where these foundations were established. A measure, then, which would at once confiscate these endowments into a general fund, thence to be dispersed, as might be thought most expedient, to the several quarters of our land, would probably deprive those places for which the endowments were intended, of their just and unquestionable rights. Even if the benefit attained should be the same, it would seem a more straight-forward and more acceptable mode, to apply directly to such places whatever funds the piety of individuals may have appropriated to their especial service.

There is, however, one immediate reform, which might be made without interfering at all with existing institutions, and in accordance with the purposes for which Cathedrals were founded. According to the Canons of our Church, which may be regarded as a commentary upon the will of the founder, the members of Chapters are re-

sponsible for the spiritual care of those parishes from which they derive their revenue. The 43rd Canon prescribes that "the Deans, Masters, Wardens, or chief Governours, Prebendaries, and Canons, &c. in every Cathedral Church, shall not only preach there in their own persons, so often as they are bound by law, statute, ordinance, or custom, but shall likewise preach in other Churches of the same diocese where they are resident, and especially in those places, where they or their Church receive any yearly rents or profits. And in case they themselves be sick, *or lawfully absent*, they shall substitute such licensed preachers to supply their turns, as by the Bishop of the diocese shall be thought meet to preach in Cathedral Churches." Allowance being made for the difference of the circumstances of those times, when a preaching Clergy was principally wanted, from the present, in which parochial ministrations are chiefly needed, it may, I think, be fairly inferred from this Canon, as also from the very fact that the cure of Churches is entrusted to them, that the Chapters are bound to provide ministers, if necessary, for the parishes, where they have property. This, the late act of the Archbishop of Canterbury enables them to do out of their property, instead of applying their income only; a measure of which I imagine there is no Chapter,*

* The Bishop of Gloucester, who has set so noble an example in devoting one-tenth of the revenue of his See to the augmenta-

which either has not, or is not preparing to avail itself. Their diligence in providing better for their several cures, might be accelerated, should it prove necessary, by extending to their case Lord Harrowby's Curates' Bill; or, if thought advisable, even a higher allowance might be required from

tion of smaller benefices, mentions in his Charge, that "several ecclesiastical patrons have already availed themselves of this Act." (Charge, 1832, p. 15.) I am myself acquainted with others which are preparing so to do, or to increase their smaller livings in some other way; and no month passes which does not bring some new account of similar acts on the part of Ecclesiastical Patrons. Yet, although a new and more effectual mode of effecting these necessary objects has thus been presented to us, it would not be right to imply that our ancestors were indifferent to them. I do not mean that they or ourselves have been sufficiently alive to these important duties, but I do mean, that it is not any idea of danger, to which the present activity is attributable. *We* have greater opportunities for benefiting our smaller livings, and therefore are bound to greater exertions. It is to vindicate our ancestors in some measure, that I consent to make the following statement of what they have done. From the proceeds of an estate left to the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, in trust by the Rev. Dr. Wm. Stratford, *one of the Canons*, the Dean and Chapter are able to augment by themselves or by benefaction to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, the great majority of their small livings. They commenced doing so in the year 1742, and finding that the progress thus made was slow, they began, in the year 1801, to tax themselves for the same purpose; and they have ever since contributed annually to the same object. The monies actually voted by them for the augmentation of curacies and small vicarages, and the repair or erection of glebe houses, independent of subscriptions to chapels, schools, &c. amount to nearly 25,000*l.* (their own contribution having,

them, than from the individual Rector. Again, it would fairly come under the same principle, that they should assist in certain proportions, according to the value of the living, in building parsonage-houses, where there is no residence; or again, where the population is too large for the provision already made for their spiritual cure, they might be required to place additional Curates at the disposal of their ministers, or should there be facilities for that purpose, to endow separate chapelries with cure of souls. And if, for the execution of these purposes, the funds required should be so large, as to reduce the Prebendal stalls below what might be considered adequate for the purposes which they are to serve, then, as in some Cathedrals, the value of one stall is assigned for the repairs of the fabric, it would seem also right, in this case, to diminish the number of the stalls, without destroying the institution. For these are purposes contemplated by the founder; and the care of the parishes committed to the Cathedrals may be regarded as one of his primary objects.

during many years, been about 500*l.*,) and the present annual return devoted to this purpose may be taken at 1000*l.* The *corporate* charities of the Dean and Chapter (I mention it because this also has been questioned,) in the last year, exclusive of the above, was about 600*l.* Private charities are, of course, too sacred ground to touch on. A more satisfactory statement is furnished by the account of the Diocese of Durham.—*Brit. Mag.* No. 13, p. 189, sqq.

The several portions of this or any similar plan, would require different degrees of time for their execution: the lessees of all Chapter property having an interest of from 14 to 21 years in it, that time must necessarily elapse, before the Chapter could come into possession of any portion, which it proposed to annex to a cure; the Chapter meanwhile would resign the fines upon this reserved portion, and a greater ulterior good would be purchased by some delay in the time when it should be conferred. The application of Lord Harrowby's act, on the contrary, might be made immediate, and Chapters might be required to devote a certain sum annually for the building of parsonage-houses on their poorer cures. Greater sacrifices would indeed thus be required of the present generation than of the succeeding; but we received our preferment, with certain duties and conditions annexed to it; and if the negligence of our ancestors in the last century has made the performance of those conditions burdensome to us, still we have only one plain line to follow—to make, namely, whatever sacrifices the performance of our duty may require at our hands. Shall we sacrifice to God of that which costs us nothing? and leave that to be executed by our successors, which we admit to be needed at present?

Not a little, I imagine, will be by these means effected, since several Chapters were unhappily endowed by Henry VIII. with the tithes which he

had taken from the monasteries, and others were compelled by Queen Elizabeth* to give up their lands and manors in exchange for those tithes which remained in her hands. When this shall have been done, and full information obtained what the real wants of the country are, and what unapplied provision there may be, then will be the time to decide what further meaures may be necessary.

The condition of our large towns must indeed be a painful and an oppressive subject of thought to every Christian mind. But the very extent of the evil is a moral pledge of its removal. Lesser, although grievous, evils may often be glossed over, or kept out of sight. Some splendid eminences, set forth in all the gorgeousness of the sun's noonday richness, arrest the eye, but we forget how cold perhaps and barren those eminences themselves may be, or how much of waste and dreariness may lie between them. We look at some splendid insulated efforts which we may have made, but forget how little these may correspond with the general character of our individual or national conduct, or of how little value it will be to have done these, and have left the other undone. It is, then, an advantage in our present evils, that when once brought forward, we cannot escape observing them; we cannot pass through, or hear of, a single manufacturing or commercial town, or a single mining

* See Bentham's Ely, p. 194, and Willis' Cathedrals.

district, without its being forced upon our minds, that a large portion of that population, the sinews of our national strength, is left ungratefully in a state of Heathenism—of Heathenism, perhaps, with the single exception that they know that they ought not to be Heathens. It must now soon be known, not merely by vague reports, or in insulated cases, or upon uncertain calculations, but accurately and officially, how scanty and meagre is the provision made for the spiritual wants of this important population, from which good or evil, Christianity or Heathenism, might so easily circulate to the remotest extremities of our land. When this shall be generally known, and the whole aggregate of our religious wants shall be brought into one focus before our eyes, I doubt not, in the least, that some set of measures, co-ordinate, as far as may be, with the necessity, will be proposed by the Heads of our Church.

Mighty efforts have not been wanting to carry Christianity to other shores: when our domestic wants shall be known, and measures digested, by which they may be regularly and judiciously supplied, without purchasing one gain by another loss, and lopping off an useful limb, in order to throw additional circulation, for the time, into the rest of the body, I doubt not those means will be provided, and that the Clergy will be, as they ought to be, the foremost to make every sacrifice for this blessed end.

Meantime, it is of much importance to the tranquil and Christian settlement of this great question, that persons should not over-eagerly attach themselves, each to their own measure of reform, but placing somewhat more confidence in the authorities of our Church, and somewhat less in themselves, should await with patience the time, when it can really and permanently be settled.

As we must at all times take heed to ourselves, most carefully in those cases, in which we think ourselves most secure, so in these days we must be especially careful, lest we think that we are in no danger of trusting in our own wisdom or our own strength, or our own spiritual views, instead of depending wholly upon Him, who is the Father of lights, the fountain of all wisdom. "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace;" and when every one is eagerly and confidently bringing in his own scheme, by which the temple of God shall be re-edified, without regard to the wisdom of past ages, or the experience of our elders, it but little resembles that first peaceful and quiet building, when

> No workman steel, no ponderous axes rung,
> Like some tall palm the noiseless fabric sprung;

it savours little of the spirit of those times, in which our more glorious temple was founded, when "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul;" and but little also of that "wisdom that is from above," which "is first

pure, then *peaceable*, gentle and easy to be entreated." Let us rather, in modesty and humility, commit our Church to Him who "loves it better than we can love it," and, under Him, to those whom His Providence has appointed to govern it; praying Him, who alone can do so, "by His continual pity to cleanse and to defend it, and because it cannot continue in safety without His succour, to preserve it evermore by His help and goodness."

APPENDIX.

The following lists of Lectures, given in different Universities of Germany, appeared calculated both to illustrate the extent to which instruction is there given, and to shew how many able men are there enabled to devote themselves to theological study. In the first list, which is translated from the German, the Lectures are arranged according to the order of the subjects: in the three last, which are taken from Latin lists, they are ranged under the names of the several Professors. The Lecture lasts three-quarters of an hour. On the efficiency of the plan, for the objects proposed, it need only be added, on the authority of the celebrated Niebühr, that two-thirds of the students, at any given time, are supposed to be diligently employed.

LECTURES.—Berlin, Oct. 1825.

	Lectures per week.
1. Universal View and History of the Theological Sciences . Prof. Dr. Marheinecke	5
2. History of the Theology of the Eighteenth Century, with the Developement of the Principles of Supernaturalism and Naturalism Prof. Lic. Tholuck	

		Lectures per week.
3. Introduction to the Old Testament	*(gratis)* Lic. Uhlemann	2
4. First fifty Psalms	Prof. Dr. Bellermann	2
5. The Psalms	Lic. Hengstenberg	5
6. Prophecies of Isaiah	Prof. Lic. Bleek	5
7. Chaldee Portions of Daniel and Jahn's Chaldee Chrestomathy	Hengstenberg	2
8. History of the Hebrews	*id.*	4
9. Passages of the Prophets relating to the Messiah	Tholuck	4
10. The Doctrine of the Old Testament as to the Messiah, and the Prophecies relating to him	*(gratis)* Uhlemann	2
11. Introduction to the New Testament	Bleek	4
12. The first three Gospels (continued)	*id.*	
13. Gospel of St. Luke	Lic. Böhmer	4
14. Acts of the Apostles	Prof. Dr. Schleiermacher	5
15. Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, and one or more of his shorter Epistles	Prof. Dr. Neander	5
16. Epistles of St. Paul to the Ephesians and Philippians	*(gratis)* Lic. Böhl	2
17. A concise View of Ecclesiastical History	Schleiermacher	4
18. Ecclesiastical History of the First Six Centuries	*(gratis)* Böhmer	2
19. Third Part of Ecclesiastical History	Neander	5
20. Characteristic of Apostolic Age, and History of the Apostles	*(publ.) id.*	1
21. Introduction to the Fathers	*id. id.*	2
22. Historical Developement of the Doctrines contained in the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches	Böhl	4

		Lectures per week.
23. Doctrinal Theology of the Christian Church	Marheinecke	5
24. Christian Faith and Doctrine	Tholuck	5
25. Principles of Sacred Oratory	Prof. Dr. Strauss	4
26. History of Preaching	*(publ.) id.*	1

PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES.

Hebrew Grammar	Uhlemann	2
Elements of Syriac	*(publ.) id.*	
Lectures in Arabic	Hengstenberg	2

PUBLIC LEARNED INSTITUTIONS.

The exercises of the Theological Seminary, in the Exposition of the Bible, conducted by Prof. Bleek and Lic. Böhmer; those relating to the History of the Church and of Christian Doctrine, by Prof. Dr. Marheinecke and Prof. Dr. Neander.

Berlin, April, 1826.

ORDINARY THEOLOGICAL PROFESSORS.

Marheinecke, Dr. and Dean *(priv.)* — Doctrinal Theology	5
Symbolical Books of Lutheran Church	5
Neander, Dr. *(priv.)*—Early Ecclesiastical History	5
St. Paul's Epistles to Colossians, Philippians, and Pastoral Epistles	5
Schleiermacher, Dr. *(priv.)*—Principles of Practical Theology	5
St. Paul's Epistles to Thessalonians and Galatians	5

Lectures per week.

Strauss, Dr. *(publ.)*—Christian Education of Youth 1 lec. 2 hours.
Practice in the Composition of Sermons 2 lec. 2 hours each.
(Priv.)—Principles of Catechising; Public Worship, and Pastoral Theology . . 5

EXTRAORDINARY PROFESSORS.

Bellermann, Dr. *(priv.)*—Psalms, from 51st to 100th
Bleek, Licentiate *(publ.)*—Theological Disputations 1
(Priv.)—Epistle to the Romans . . 5
Minor Prophets . . . 6
Daniel, and Chaldee Chapters of Ezra, with a brief View of Biblical Chaldee .
Hengstenberg, Licentiate—Genesis . . 4
Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament . . . 4

PRIVATE INSTRUCTORS.

Böhl, (*gratis*)—Introduction to Symbolical Books of Lutheran Church . 1 lec. 2 hours.
(*Priv.*)—St. Matthew . . . 5
Uhlemann, (*gratis*)—Compendium of Ecclesiastical History to the Reformation . . 3
(*Priv.*)—Job 3
(*Very priv.* i. e. *to individuals*)—Elements of Hebrew 2
Practice in the Theological Seminary conducted by Marheinecke and Neander
Royal Academy.—Dr. Schleiermacher, (*priv.*)—Elements of Instruction of the Young . . 5
Private Teacher.—Dr. Hengstenberg.—Elements of Syriac 2

Göttingen, April, 1825.

THEOLOGIANS.

D. G. J. Planck, Dr.—Early Ecclesiastical History.
History of Christian Doctrine

Staüdlin.—A View and History of the several Theological Sciences, with the Order in which they should be studied.
Universal History of the Christian Church from the Reformation.

Pott.—The three first Gospels, with copious Discussions on the principal Jewish ideas mentioned in the New Testament.
Elements of Hebrew.
Principles of the Art of Preaching.
Practice in the Composition of Sermons in the Royal Homiletical Seminary.

Planck, H.—The first three Gospels.
Historical and Critical Introduction to the New Testament.
Practice of the Theological Society.

EXTRAORDINARY PROFESSOR.

Hemsen, (*priv.*)—Doctrinal Theology.
(*publ.*)—Instruction in Sacred Oratory, followed by Practice in the Composition of Sermons.

PHILOLOGICAL PROFESSORS.

Eichhorn.—First Part of the Epistles.
The Pentateuch.

Tychsen.—Introduction to the Languages and Literature of the Semitic Nations.
Arabic Grammar.
(*Publ.*)—The Prophecies concerning the Messiah.

Lectures per week.

Bonn, May, 1827.

ORDINARY THEOLOGICAL PROFESSORS OF THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH.

Augusti, Dr (*publ.*)—Historical and Critical Introduction to the Theology of the Fathers . 2
(*Priv.*)—Doctrinal Theology. . . 6
Genesis, with brief Synopsis of the Pentateuch 4

Lücke, Dr. (*publ.*)—1. Part 3. of Ecclesiastical History from the Reformation . . 4
(*Priv.*)—2. St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans . 5
3. Historical and Critical Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament . .
(*Very privately*)—Practice in the Interpretation of Scripture . . . 4

Gieseler, Dr. (*publ.*)—Hebrew Antiquities . 1
(*Priv.*)—Epistle to the Hebrews, and those of St. James, and St. Peter . . 5
Second Part of Ecclesiastical History . 6

Nitzsch, Dr. (*publ.*)—The several Theological Sciences, and the order in which they should be studied 3
(*Priv.*)—Biblical Theology of the Old Testament 4
Christian Worship, (Liturgic) . . 1

Sack, Dr. (*publ.*)—Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, in the Original, with Reference to the Use thence to be derived, for Catechising and Preaching 3
(*Priv.*)—The System of Christian Morals . 4

The two last were the University Preachers.

Lectures per week.

PHILOLOGICAL PROFESSOR.

Freytag, Dr. (*priv.*)—Genesis, with Reference to History and Grammar . . 4

(*Publ.*)—Lectures in Arabic . 2

Practice of the Royal Theological Seminary conducted by Drs. Augusti, Lücke, and Gieseler; that of the Homiletical and Catechetical Seminary by Drs. Nitzsch and Sack.

It may not be without interest, to observe the provision made for the same object in two different portions of the Roman Catholic Church. Two lists are therefore added: one, that of the Roman Catholic Lectures at Bonn; the other, those of the University of Rome, as furnished by a Latin list, given by Professor Tholuck, in an article on "Theological Education in Italy," in the Literarischen Anzeiger. The article is translated in Prof. Robinson's Biblical Repository, No. VI.

Bonn, May, 1827.

Lectures per week.

Hermes, Dr.—Internal and External Truth of the Books of the New Testament; Faithfulness of Oral Tradition; Authority of the Christian Ministry . (*publ.*) 5

Critical History of the different modes in which Christian, especially Doctrinal, Theology has been treated from the beginning till now, particularly the so-called Scholastic Method, and that of the present day 1

	Lectures per week.
Third portion of Doctrinal Theology; of Man's Original Condition, Fall, and Restoration through Christ; of Grace, the Sacraments, and Prayer, including an Account of the gradual developement and clearer statements of these Doctrines in successive Centuries . .	6
Ritter, Dr.—Ecclesiastical History from the Sixteenth Century to the present day . (*publ.*)	3
From Boniface, Apostle of the Germans, to the Sixteenth Century . .	5
Lives and Writings of the Fathers .	3
Historical Disputations on select portions of Ecclesiastical History . (*very priv.*)	
Scholz, Dr.—Psalms . . . (*publ.*)	3
Epp. to Thessalonians, Galatians, Philippians, Timothy, Titus, and Apocalypse .	6
Principles of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation	3
Compass and Order of Theological Study .	3
Latin Exercises in the Interpretation of Old and New Testament (if desired)	
Achterfeldt, Dr.—Introduction to, and first division of, Christian Morals . . (*publ.*)	6
On Catechizing, and the Composition of Sermons . . .	6

Rome, 1827.

The Lectures were given by seven different Professors; six of whom were Members of different Monastic Orders. The subjects were—1. Biblical Antiquities, and Principles of Interpretation. 2. On Grace and Justification; and

therein of Faith, Hope, and Charity. 3. Scholastic Theology; the Sacraments in general; Penance, Indulgences, and Extreme Unction. 4. Theology, according to the several Loci Theologici. 5. Moral Theology, conclusion of the duties towards God, then of the duties to Men. 6. Ecclesiastical History from Charlemagne to the First Lateran Council. 7. Sacred Physiology; the Works of the Fifth and Sixth Days of the Mosaic Cosmogony.

Besides these, an 8th Theological Course, on Sacred Eloquence, was at that time omitted; and in the Philological Class, we find, by different Professors,—1. Lectures in the Old Testament from the Pentateuch to Kings. 2 and 3. Lectures in Arabic and Syro-Chaldaic.

APPENDIX B.

CENTURY OF ENGLISH CATHEDRAL DIVINES.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Abroad.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Canon.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1466	1. Colet, Dean.	22	4 (studying at Paris and in Italy.)	—	æt. 39.	lectured at Oxford to Drs. æt. 31—39.	—	—	—
1489	2. Cranmer, Abp.	26	æt. 41—43.	(to King) æt. 40.	—	æt. 34, read Div. Lect. in College, and Examiner in Divinity.	—	—	as Archbishop.
1499	3. Cox, Bp.	8 (deprived)	(Q. Mary) 5.	tutor to Edw. VI. æt. 44.	Jun. Can. Cardinal College, æt. 20-26; & æt. 42, 3, 4, 7, 9, 50.	Master of Eton about æt. 27.	æt. 47.	—	as Dean, had great hand in compiling Liturgy; as Bishop, in revising it, and in Bishops' Bible.
1500	4. Redmayne.	Oxford, Fell. at Cambridge.	studying at Paris till æt. 21.	—	æt. 40.	Pub. Orator æt. 37.	previously, and æt. 46.	—	Com. Prayer, and posthumous.
about 1500	5. Ridley, Bp.	17	(2 study.)	to Cranmer, 3.	about æt. 42.	Public Reader in Univ. æt. 37.	about æt. 40.	—	aided in 39 Articles.

(1.) Left Commentaries on Gospels and on St. Paul, the result of Lectures; had searched into the Fathers and Schoolmen—"there was not one book relating to the History and Constitution of the Church, which he had not carefully perused." ob. 1519, æt. 53.

(2.) "Being of wonderful diligence, he drew out of all the authors which he read, every thing that was remarkable, digesting those quotations into Common Place."

(3.) "Reputed one of the greatest Scholars of his age;" deprived æt. 24, on suspicion of "heresy"; "chief Protestant champion" at Westminster Conference.

(4.) Studied Scripture carefully for twenty years; convinced of the falsehood of Transubstantiation by searching Scripture and Fathers to prove it. ob. æt. 51.

(5.) Studied at the Sorbonne; promoted by Cranmer for "his extraordinary proficience in Theology;" the best disputant of his time.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Abroad.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Canon.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
about 1503	6. May, (nominated Abp.)	—	—	—	about æt. 42 & 43.	—	about æt. 34.	about æt. 35.	as Dean, Com. Prayer, Reform. Legg. &c.
1504	7. Parker, Abp.	14	—	—	æt. 30 and 48.	—	æt. 40.	æt. 38—40.	as Archbishop.
1511	8. Nowell.	22	(Q. Mary) 5.	Schoolmaster at Westminster, about 5.	æt. 40.	—	—	—	as Dean of St. Paul's.
1517	9. Fox.	12 (expelled)	(Q. Mary) 5.	tutor in family, 8.	æt. 46.	—	—	—	abroad, or Preb. of Salisb.
1519	10. Sandys, Abp.	12	(Q. Mary) 4.	—	æt. 30.	—	æt. 28.	—	as Head, Dean and Bishop.
1519	11. Grindall, Abp.	17	(Q. Mary) 5.	to Ridley, æt. 31; to King, æt. 32.	æt. 32 and 33.	Margaret Preacher, æt. 30.	æt. 33 & 40.	—	aided Fox, and contributed much.
1521	12. Aylmer, Bp.	—	(Q. Mary) 5.	tutor to Lady Jane Gray.	æt. 32, Archdeac. of Stow; æt. 41, of Lincoln.	—	—	—	—

(6.) "Scarce any considerable step taken towards the Reformation under Henry 8, or Edw. 6, without consulting his opinion; was of great service to the Bishops in those troublesome times; sinecure conferred on account of his frequent avocations in Commissions, &c."
(7.) Read over Fathers and Councils for five or six years after Degree.
(8.) While at University, very famous for piety and learning. ob. 1601.
(9.) Before thirty, had read over Greek and Latin Fathers, Schoolmen, Councils, &c.; and acquired competent knowledge of Hebrew. ob. 1587.
(10.) Westminster Conference, Liturgy, Bishops' Bible; "being a man well skilled in the original languages."
(12.) Refused Professorship of Hebrew at Jena, hoping soon to return home. "Well seen in the three learned tongues, and particularly in the Hebrew;" "understood Scripture thoroughly, and throughout life never hid his talent; well read in the Fathers, and Eccles. History."

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Abroad.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1522	13. Jewell, Bp.	19	(Q. Mary) 5.	—	—	—	Vice-Master Theol. Coll. Strasburg, 5 years.	—	as Bishop.
1530	14. Whitgift, Abp.	19	—	(to Bp. Cox)	æt. 38.	æt. 32, Marg. Lect. æt. 33, Marg. Prof. æt. 37, Reg. Prof.	æt. 37.	near Camb.	as Head & Preb.
1538	15. Holland.	never left.	—	—	æt. 51.	æt. 54.	æt. 51.	—	—
1544	15[a]. Bancroft, Abp.	13	—	(to Bp. Cox & Abp. Whitgift)	æt. 45, 48, and 50.	—	—	æt. 31, near Camb.; æt. 40, Lond. Living.	—
1545	16. Lively.	Fell. Trin. Coll.	—	—	æt. 57.	æt. 30—60.	—	—	as Professor.
about 1549	17. Whitaker.	never left.	—	—	—	æt. 31.	æt. 37.	—	as Professor, or posthumous.
1549	18. Reynolds, J.	32	—	—	æt. 49.	—	æt. 49.	—	Translator.

(13.) Promoted for his great merit and learning.
(14.) Wished to resign Headship, in order to complete "Answer to Admonition," which required more ease of mind and leisure. ob. 1609.
(15.) "In his chair he got the admiration both of that University (Oxford), and of foreign Universities also; as famous for religion and holiness as for learning."
(15[a].) A learned controversialist, an excellent preacher; "countenanced men of the most solid parts in learning, and disposed the Clergy to a more solid course of study, than they had been accustomed to."—*Lord Clarendon.*
(16.) A chief Translator and valued Commentator; hastened death by exertions in perfecting the English Version.
(17.) Opponent of Bellarmine, "respected by him for his learning;" works republished abroad. ob. 1595.
(18.) Exchanged Deanery of Lincoln for Headship, for the sake of study.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1550	19. Bilson, Bp.	Fellow.	Master of Winchester.	æt. 26.	—	Warden of Winchester.	—	as Preb.
1553	20. Hooker.	17.	Master of the Temple 6 years.	—	—	—	—	*See p.* 107.
1555	21. Andrewes, Bp.	—	—	æt. 34.	Div. Lecturer at Camb.	æt. 34.	London Living.	mostly posthumous.
1560	22. Abbot, Bp.	—	toKg.abt.æt.43.	æt. 52.	æt. 50.	æt. 49.	—	whole life.
1560	23. Boys.	22.	—	æt. 55.	Chief Greek Lecturer in Coll. 10 yrs.	—	æt. 36.	Translator, mostly posthumous.
about 1560	24. Overall, Bp.	Fellow of Trin. College.	—	about æt. 42.	about æt. 36—47.	about æt. 38—54.	—	Translator, and Convocation Book, as Dean.
about 1570	25. Davenant, Bp.	about 27.	—	—	Margaret Div. abt. æt. 39–51.	abt. æt. 44-52.	Marg. Preacher, æt. 39 and 42.	as Div. Professor.
1573	26. Laud, Abp.	21.	—	æt. 41.	—	æt. 38—48.	Living, 1 year.	as Bishop.
1574	27. Hall, Bp.	12 or 13.	in Embassy, Scotland. abroad at Dort.	æt. 42.	—	—	about æt. 28.	as Preb. of Wolverhampton, Dean of Worcester, and Bishop.

(19.) Hampton Court Conference and Revision of Eng. Vers., as Bishop.

(21.) His College Div. Lectures attended from other Colleges, and from the country; at St. Paul's, read Div. Lectures three times a week. Eng. Vers. as Dean; as Bishop, gave forenoon and evening to study. Secretary Walsingham would not let him take a country benefice, lest he and his great learning should be buried. ob. 1629.

(23.) In summer studied often from 4 A.M. to 8 P.M. Gr. Lect. at 4 A.M. attended by Fellows. Four years nine months in translation of Bible. Assisted Sir H. Savile in edition of Chrysostom; "left as many leaves in MS. as would tell against the many days of his long life." Twenty-eight last years at Ely; studied eight hours a day in old age. ob. æt. 83.

(24.) Monument erected to him by Bishop Cosin, as one of the profoundest School Divines of our nation.

(26.) Read Divinity Lectures in College, æt. 27.

(27.) Gave up Rhet. Lect. at Cambridge to Dr. Dod, thinking it diverted him from study of Divinity.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1574	28. Gataker.	11.	Preacher, Lincoln's Inn, æt. 27—37.	—	—	—	æt. 37.	chiefly, when unable to discharge pastoral duty.
1578	28[a]. Prideaux, Bp.	Fellow.	—	æt. 35.	Div. æt. 35—62.	æt. 34—64.	—	as Prof., Head, Canon.
1579	29. Jackson.	28.	—	æt. 56.	—	æt. 51—61.	æt. 44—51.	as Fellow, or posthumous.
1580	30. Usher, Abp.	24.	—	æt. 27.	æt. 27—40.	[declined]	—	principal, before he was Bishop (æt. 40), or after expulsion (æt. 60), at Oxford.
1584	31. Hales.	16.	—	æt. 55.	—	Fell. of Eton, æt. 29.	—	posthumous (ejected).
1586	32. Mede.	whole life as Fellow.	—	—	—	—	—	——
1587	33. Sanderson, Bp.	18.	—	æt. 42.	æt. 55—61.	—	æt. 31.	Sermons, as parochial Minister; Lectures De Juramento, &c. as Professor (ejected).
1594	34. Cosin, Bp.	8.	8 to Bishops, 6 at Paris.	æt. 30.	—	about æt. 40—49.	æt. 32.	at Paris (ejected).
1600	35. Heylin.	16.	to King, æt. 29.	æt. 31.	—	—	æt. 31.	as Preb. and ejected.
1600	36. Walton, Bp.	7.	to King, æt. 36.	about æt. 39.	—	—	Lond. æt. 26.	while ejected from livings.
1602	37. Sparrow, Bp.	—	—	æt. 59.	—	æt. 60—67.	—	——
1602	38. Chillingworth.	20 (at Douay, study 3).	—	æt. 36.	—	—	—	at Oxford.

(28.) Would not accept any other preferment (than Lincoln's Inn); this was "safe," and afforded plenty of time for study of the original Scriptures, early Fathers, &c.; refused Mastership of Trinity (Dr. T. Comber ejected).
(30.) Employed 18 years on study of Fathers and Councils.
(34.) Abroad six years, (first Clergyman ejected); had apartments in Louvre and pension; before, "very constant in residence."

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1602	39. Lightfoot.	4 (usher in school 2).	6 or 7.	æt. 65.	—	æt. 41—66.	æt. 26—28; Lond.† æt. 28—30.	principal as Head, Preb., or posthumous.
1604	40. Pococke.	12.‡	(in the East) æt. 26—32, 33—36.	æt. 46, 7; restored æt. 56.	Arab. æt. 32; Heb. æt. 46, 7.	—	æt. 36.	Syriac N. T. æt. 26, as Fellow; the rest, as Prof.
1605	41. Hammond.	15.	(to King.)	æt. 39—43.	—	Orator, æt. 39.	æt. 28—38.	——
1606	42. Castell.	many years.	(to Kg.) æt. 60.	æt. 62.	Arab. æt. 58.	—	—	as Preb. of Canterbury.
1607	43. Barlow, Bp.	never left.	—	æt. 53.	Metaph. æt. 28; (Bodl. Libr. æt. 36;) Marg. Div. æt. 53.	æt. 40.	Lecturer, from Oxford.	as Professor, and Bishop.
1612	44. Pearson, Bp.	9.	3.	æt. 48—50.	—	æt. 48, & 50-63.	*Preacher;* Lond. Liv. æt. 31; Living, æt. 48—50.	as *Preacher*, Preb., Head, and Bishop.
1613	45. Greaves.	21 (ejected fr. fellowship).	—	æt. 53—63.	dep. Arabic Reader for Pococke, æt. 24—27.	—	—	——
1614	46. Wilkins, Bp.	8.	about 7.	æt. 40.	—	æt. 34—46.	Liv. æt. 46—48; Lond. Liv. æt. 48—56; Preach. Gray's Inn, æt. 46.	as Chaplain and Head; chief works posthumous.
1616	47. Owen.	9.	about 4, æt. 21—25.	æt. 34.	—	æt. 34—43.	æt. 26—32; Dublin, æt. 32.	before and after Living.

(39.) Laid foundations of Rabbinical learning as Chaplain to Sir R. Cotton.
† Removed to London for the sake of Sion College Library.
‡ Including some time spent in the study of Arabic under Bedwell. Living very small (ejected).
(42.) Prebend given soon *after* Restoration as recompense for 18 years' labour of 16 or 18 hours each day, and expenditure of £12,000.
(44.) Sermons on Creed preached; chief editor of Critici Sacri (when Preb.).
(47.) When ejected from Deanery, retired to private estate.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1616	47[b]. Sancroft, Abp.	17 (ejected).	(to Bp.Cosin.)	æt. 45 and 48.	—	æt. 48—51.	—	——
1617	48. Cudworth.	whole life,exc. 2 or 3 years.	—	æt. 61.	æt. 28—71.	æt. 28–36–71.	—	as Prof., Head, Preb.
1618	49. Smith, John.	16.	—	—	—	—	—	posthumous.
1619	50. Allestree.	12 (ejected).	(abroad) 12.	æt. 41—60.	æt. 41—60.	Prov. of Eton, æt. 46.	—	posthumous.
1625	51. Outram.	Fell.of Christ's & Trin. Coll.	—	æt. 45.	—	—	London mostly.	as Preb. of Westminster, with London Living.
1625	52. Fell, Bp.	whole life.	—	æt. 35.	—	æt. 35.	—	as Canon and Bishop.
1626	53. Patrick, Bp.	7.	in family abt.7. (toKg.) æt.40.	æt. 46.	—	—	æt. 32 ; Lond. Liv. æt. 36.	Commentaries, as Dean and Bishop ; before, single Sermons only.
1627	54. W. Lloyd, Bp.	9 (and as tutor 3).	in family 6.	æt. 33 and 47.	—	—	æt. 27—29 ; æt. 41.	as Preb. and Bishop.
1630	55. Barrow.	9 (&abroad 6).	(to Bishop) æt. 39—42.	—	Gr. æt. 30–2 ; Gresh.Geom. 32—4; Lucasian, 34—9.	æt. 43—47.	—	published Mathematics as Prof. ; Theolog. Works posthumous, written with Bp. Ward, and as Head.

(47[b].) " Wrote more perhaps with his own hand than any man either of this or the last age."—*Whiston.*
(48.) His academical income not being sufficient to maintain him, (whether owing to the neglect of the things of this world or other cause,) he left for a while, but, being much loved, was soon invited thither again.
(49.) " A living library, which stood open for any that would converse withal." ob. æt. 34.
(51.) " Here he concluded his course with great praise and profit, but in the midst of so great labours and mental exertion in the ardent study of Holy Scripture and the Fathers"—ob. æt. 54.
(53.) Refused St. Martin's in the Fields as too laborious.
(54.) See Burnet's account of him in Biogr. Brit.
(55.) Resigned professorship to Newton, in order to apply exclusively to Divinity. As Master of Trinity, took many hours from morning sleep to increase his stock of Sermons, and write treatise on Pope's Supremacy. See Life, Works, ed. 1830, p. xix. sqq.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1630	56. Spencer.	never left.	—	æt. 42.	—	æt. 37.	—	as Dean of Ely, & Head.
1630	57. Tillotson, Abp.	10.	tutor in family 4.	æt. 39.	—	—	Curacy, æt. 31—3; Living, æt. 33.	as Preacher of Linc. Inn, Preb. and Dean.
1633 about	58. South.	12.	(to D.of York) æt. 34.	æt. 30 and 37.	(Publ. Orat.) æt. 27.	—	æt. 45.	as Canon and Preb.
1633	59. Kidder, Bp.	Fellow.	—	about æt. 48.	—	—	—	Prebendary of Norwich, and Bishop.
1634	60. Bull, Bp.	removed early from Oxford, not to take the engagement.	studies privately.	æt. 44. Bp. 69.	—	—	early, very small, æt. 24—51.	chief works as Preb.
1635	61. Stillingfleet, Bp.	6.	3.	æt. 35 and 42; Bp. 54.	—	—	London Living, æt. 29—54.	chief works as Canon, Dean, some as Bishop; before, only Sermons.
1636	62. Hyde.	never left.	—	æt. 61.	Heb. Reader, æt. 22; Professor, æt. 61.	Bodl.Libr. æt. 29.	—	Whole Life.
1637	63. Cave.	—	—	æt. 47.	—	—	London Living, æt. 25—52.	chiefly on London Livings.
1638	64. Whitby.	11.	(to Bp.) 4.	æt. 34.	—	—	—	as Fellow, and Precentor of Salisbury.

(57.) First volume of Sermons preached at Linc. Inn; began course of Divinity with an exact study of Scripture for 4 or 5 years: then all the old philosophers and ethical writers, and of Fathers, chiefly Basil and Chrysostom.
(58.) Illness brought on by study; refused Bishoprics repeatedly; time spent between living, Oxford, and estate.
(60.) Preb. given by Chancellor Finch as reward for "Harmon. Apostol."; Archdeaconry, by Abp. Sancroft; two Livings, together 100*l.* per annum, not 30 families; kept curates; chief works before larger parish.
(62.) Assisted in Polyglot before æt. 20.
(63.) Retired, æt. 53, to Isleworth, which, being a retired place, better suited his studious habits.
(64.) Commentary on N. T. after 15 years' labour; "wholly devoted to his severe studies;" read Lectures for Bishop Burnet at Salisbury.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1640	65. S. Parker, Bp.	7.	toNobleman,4. to Bishop, 5.	æt. 32.	—	æt. 47.	—	as Preb. of Canterbury.
1640	66. Sherlock, W.	—	—	æt. 50.	Mast. of Temple, æt. 44.	—	Lond. Liv. æt. 28.	Whole life.
1641	67. Allix.	came to England æt. 44.	—	æt. 49.	—	—	—	all but "Reflections," as Treas. of Salisb.
1642	68. Hickes.	14.	tutor or chaplain, 6.	æt. 38 and 41—48.	—	—	London Living, æt. 38—44.	as Preb. and deprived (Suffrag. Bp.)
1544	69. Comber.	—	—	æt. 33.	—	—	—	as Preb. and Precentor of York.
1645	70. Mill.	20.	—	æt. 31 and 59.	—	æt. 40—63.	æt. 36—40.	Preb. of Canterbury, and Head.
1647	71. Aldrich.	never left.	—	æt. 34.	—	æt. 42.	æt. 34.	Canon and Dean.
1648	72. Prideaux, H.	18.	—	æt. 33 and 54.	Heb. Lecturer at Ch. Ch.	—	æt. 42—6.	Student, Preb., and great work as Dean.
1656	73. Jenkin.	Fellow.	to Bp. Lake; & æt. 34—54.	æt. 32.	Marg. Div. æt. 55—71.	æt. 55.	—	as Precentor; "Reasonableness," as Chaplain.
1656	74. Fleetwood, Bp.	—	—	æt. 46.	—	Fell. of Eton.	—	as Fellow of Eton and Canon.
1657	75. Wake, Abp.	10.	(Embassy) 2.	æt. 31.	Preach. Gray's Inn, æt. 27.	—	—	partly at Gray's Inn, chiefly as Canon.
1657	76. Derham.	—	—	æt. 59.	—	—	—	before Canonry.

(66.) "Discourse on Death," while suspended (1688-91.)
(68.) "Deeply read in the Primitive Fathers; no one better understood the doctrine, worship, constitution and discipline of the Catholic Church."
(70.) Published N. T. after "thirty years continuous and incredible labour," the year of his death, æt. 62. Preb. obtained by Abp. Sharp.
(71.) Published one piece of some Greek writer, yearly, for students.
(72.) Æt. 38, settled on Prebend; æt. 46, returned to Norwich, "being stopped in his work by want of books, and by country business:" while at Oxford, kept a Curate on his living, served it on Sunday only.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1659	77. Hody.	18.	to Abp. 4.	—	Gr. æt. 39.	Archd. æt. 48.	—	early, and as Professor.
1661	78. Lowth, W.	—	to Bp.	æt. 35.	—	—	æt. 38.	"Vindication," as Chaplain; "Commentaries," as Preb.
1662	79. Bentley.	6, and æt. 27, as tutor.	in Bp. Stillingfleet's fam. 14.	æt. 30.	æt. 67.	æt. 38.	—	"Boyle Lectures," as Preb.
1662	80. Hudson.	never left, Fellow, æt. 24—49.	—	—	Bodl. Libr. æt. 39.	æt. 50.	—	Theolog. posthumous.
1662	81. Gastrell, Bp.	14.	Preacher Linc. Inn, æt. 32.	æt. 40.	—	—	—	"Boyle Lect." at Linc. Inn; the rest, as Canon.
1662	82. Atterbury, Bp.	11.	Rolls, æt. 36.	æt. 42.	—	æt. 50.	Lect. and Chap. æt. 29—36.	at Oxford, at the Rolls, and as Canon.
1663	83. Smalridge, Bp.	10.	—	æt. 30 and 48.	often dep. Professor at Oxf. æt. 37—44.	æt. 50.	Lect. æt. 29.	at Oxford, and posthumous.
1668	84. Chandler, Bp.	—	to Bp. Lloyd, æt. 25.	æt. 38.	—	—	—	as Bishop.
1669	85. Gibson, Bp.	10.	Libr. at Lambeth, æt. 27—34.	æt. 34, and sinecure.	—	—	Preacher, æt. 28. London Living, æt. 34.	Fellow, Precentor, and Canon of Chichester and Archdeacon, with sinecure; as Bishop, Pastoral Charges only.
1670	86. Hare, Bp.	Fellow, prob. 18.	—	æt. 37, 45, and 56.	—	Fell. of Eton, æt. 42.	—	chiefly posthumous.
1673	87. Tanner, Bp.	12.	—	Chanc. Norw. æt. 28; Bp.'s Com. æt. 30; Preb. 40 and 50.	—	—	æt. 33.	"Notitia Monast." at Oxford, æt. 22; the rest as Prebendary, or posthumous.

(81.) Ob. æt. 73, at Christ Church.
(85.) His great work, "Codex Juris Angl.," prepared with the encouragement and advice of Abp. Tenison while Librarian—published while Canon, &c.
(87.) As Chancellor, much consulted, e. g. even by Abp. Wake and Bp. Gibson. ob. 1735, æt. 62, at Christ Church.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Can. Preb.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1674	88. Potter, Abp.	16.	to Abp. Tenison, 4.	æt. 34.	Div. æt. 34.	—	—	Theological, as Chaplain, Professor, and Canon; Classical, at Oxford, chiefly as Fellow.
1678	89. Sherlock, Bp.	—	Master of Temple, æt. 26—75.	æt. 38.	—	æt. 36.	—	as Master of Temple, Dean of Chichester; as Bishop, "Trial of Witnesses." ob. æt. 83.
1678	90. Wilkins, D.	—	Libr. at Lambeth, æt. 37—40; Chapl. to Abp. æt. 41.	æt. 42.	Arab. æt. 46—51.	—	—	—
1683	91. Waterland.	14.	to King, æt. 34.	Chanc. York, æt. 40; Windsor, æt. 44.	—	æt. 30—58.	Lond. Liv. æt. 33—47; Twickenham, æt. 47—58.	Whole life. ob. æt. 58.
1684	92. Mangey.	Fellow.	Preacher Lincoln's Inn; to Bp. Robinson about æt. 36.	æt. 37.	—	—	—	"Philo Judæus," as Preb. of Durham; other works as Preacher of Lincoln's Inn.
1690	93. Z. Pearce, Bp.	Fellow.	to Nobleman, æt. 27.	æt. 49.	—	—	æt. 29.	Theolog. works, chiefly posthumous.
1691	94. Conybeare, Bp.	whole life, but 1 year.	—	æt. 41.	—	æt. 39.	Curacy, æt. 25—26; Liv. æt. 33.*	as Dean of Ch. Ch.

(91.) Preferment (certainly all the later), reward of past services; life, from æt. 16—38, spent at Cambridge: from 47—58, between Twickenham, Cambridge, and Windsor. "Archdeaconry of Middlesex particularly suited to his habits and acquirements;" for his assistance in the valuable Theological productions of others, see *Bishop Van Mildert's Life*, p. 311 and 314, sqq. "— is gone to offer up to God a whole life laid out, or rather worn out in his service."—*Seed, ib.*

(93.) Delayed Ordination, to prepare himself; did not wish for Bishopric, but to resign London Living, and live on Deanery and private fortune.

* Very small village, now part of Oxford.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1692	95. Butler, Bp.	—	Preacher at Rolls, æt. 26—34.	æt. 41.	—	—	æt. 34—41, wholly.	"Sermons," at the Rolls; "Analogy," as Prebendary.
1698	96. Warburton, Bp.	clerk to Attorney.	Preacher Lincoln's Inn, æt. 48.	æt. 57.	—	—	æt. 28—48.	before and after Prebend.
1701	97. Randolph.	with short interval, 22.	—	æt. 67.	dep. Div. Professor, æt. 36—40; Marg. Prof., æt. 67.	æt. 47.	æt. 40—47.	chiefly as Head and Professor.
1704	98. Newton, Bp.	6.	tutor in family.	æt. 53.	—	—	London Living, æt. 40; before, Preacher.	Larger part of work on "Prophecies," as Prebendary.
1707	99. Horbery.	Fellow.	to Bishop.	Canon of Lichfield.	—	—	—	as Fellow, or posthumous.
1710	100. Lowth, Bp.	Fellow.	—	Preb. Durham, about æt. 46; Archd. Winchester, æt. 40.	Poetry, æt. 31.	—	—	Professor, Prebendary, and Bishop.

(95.) Spent half the year on Living.

(96.) Studied for Orders, æt. 20—28; usually sat up part of night, rarely left home. On appointment to Lincoln's Inn, he complains, "I shall be obliged to write Sermons, and what will become of the 'Divine Legation'?" "His instructions to his parish had either been delivered without notes, or extracted from the plainest discourses of our best preachers." *Bishop Hurd.*——Promoted to Bishopric by Mr. Pitt, for merit. Yet "religion and learning suffered something by his promotion, as it interrupted those designs which he had formed for the service of both." *Id.*

(97.) Undertook, for a short time, a Cure near enough to Oxford to allow of his continuing his studies; after a few years, returned to stricter residence; as Head, devoted much time to study.

(99.) Preferred Standlake (small living) as nearer to Oxford, and a retired situation.

Yr. of Birth.	*Names.*	*Years at University.*	*Chaplain.*	*Preb. Can.*	*Professor.*	*Head Coll.*	*First Living.*	*Works how Published.*
1716	101. Balguy.	—	—	æt. 41; Archdeacon, æt. 43.	—	—	æt. 30.	as Prebendary.
1716	102. Shuckford.	—	—	Preb. of Canterbury. æt. 52.	—	—	—	—
1718	103. Kennicott.	never left.	to Bp. Lowth.		—	Radcl. Libr. æt. 49.	æt. 42.*	as Fellow; and great work, as Canon.
1733	104. Horsley, Bp.	7(probably), and æt. 35, as tutor.	to Bp. Lowth, æt. 44.	æt. 52; Minor Preb. æt. 44; Archdeac. St. Alban's, æt. 48.	—	—	æt. 26.	Chaplain, Prebendary, with small Benefice, or posthumous.
1749	105. Holmes.	Fellow.	—	Canon of Salisbury; Ch. Ch. æt. 46—55.	Poetry, æt. 34.	—	—	as Fellow, or as Canon.

(101.) ob. æt. 79, at Winchester.

* Living close by Oxford; another Living from Bishop Lowth, in Cornwall, where he intended to reside as soon as he had finished his great work, but his health being too much impaired, he resigned it a year or two before his death, æt. 65.

Roake and Varty, Printers, 31, Strand.

499/0x

GTU Library
3 2400 00781 1221